



American
ical & Classical
bookseller,
S. Fourth St.
Philadelphia.


Theological Society -

182.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Princeton, N. J.

BX 9847 .H3 1821 c.1
Hare, Edward, 1774-1818.
A preservative against the
errors of Socinianism



PRESERVATIVE AGAINST THE ERRORS OF SOCINIANISM:

In Answer

TO

*THE REV. JOHN GRUNDY'S LECTURES ON THE PRINCIPAL
DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY.*

BY THE LATE REV. EDWARD HARE.

"ALL TRUTH IS FROM THE SEMIETERNAL SOURCE
"OF LIGHT DIVINE." *Couper.*

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

PRINTED AND SOLD BY JAMES NICHOLS,
22, Warwick Square, Paternoster Row;

SOLD ALSO BY SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL, 14, STATIONERS' COURT;
BLANSHARD, 14, CITY-ROAD; AND OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1821.

ENTERED AT STATIONERS' HALL.

PREFACE.

IN a prefatory address, it is not uncommon for the Author to assign reasons for his undertaking, to advertise the substance of his work, to obviate vulgar prejudices, and to apologize for his defect in the execution of his design, or conciliate the candour of the Public. But when, as in the present instance, a book has been published in periodical parts, and the principal parts have been some time in the hands of the Purchasers before the Preface is actually written, such an address would be merely formal.

It is already known that the Lectures recently delivered and published by the Rev. John Grundy, comprise, with some original matter, the arguments and objections commonly urged by the *Socinians* against what he justly, but inconsistently, calls “the principal doctrines of Christianity:” and that this work was originally intended to be a preservative against the errors which he has zealously and industriously laboured to disseminate. The manner in which this defence is conducted, is now before the religious Public, who have rendered all apologies unnecessary by exercising that candour to which the Author wished to appeal, and which he now feels it his duty gratefully to acknowledge.

This acknowledgment is not, however, intended to be made to those who have adopted Mr. G.’s creed, without imitating his candour: some of whom will probably confess that it would not be very appropriate. “Liberality of sentiment” is sometimes only another name for BIGOTRY: and “calm inquiry” is often confined to

one side of a question. The Author does not need to be informed that many of them regard his opposition to their prejudices as a sufficient proof of his “illiberality;”—that others of them condemn him without a hearing, because he has attempted to vindicate what they “never will believe;”—that some of them lay aside the PRESERVATIVE, after five minutes’ examination, because “he sets out on principles very different from theirs;”—or that they know beforehand, from his denomination, that “he is one of those fanatics.” As these are not the men who are “willing to become fools, that they may be made wise,” he confesses that to them he has no apology to offer. He can only pray, that “God, who commanded light to shine out of darkness, may shine in their hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.”

There is one subject on which he thinks it providential that he has this opportunity for explaining himself. According to credible report, at a provincial meeting of Unitarian Ministers, recently held at Monton Green, in the vicinity of Manchester, Mr. G. was pleased to announce that “his main arguments are left untouched.”—The arguments which he has adduced in his Lectures, may be separated into two classes. Many of them bear upon the statements here intended to be vindicated. To these, it is hoped, the Reader will find in the work before him, a direct answer. But others of them are levelled against such statements of the doctrines in question, as the Author did not feel himself under any obligation to defend. These are probably what Mr. G. calls his “main arguments.” Every man who is not a volunteer in faith, entertains his own opinion on the scriptural truths which he

holds in common with his brethren : and while he modestly declines to dictate to others, he may reasonably be allowed to vindicate the general doctrines according to his own modification of them, without being made responsible for the precision of those statements from which his opponent imagines himself to derive considerable advantage. To answer directly this class of Mr. G.'s arguments, would be to vindicate those human systems which he has selected as the most vulnerable, instead of that divine system of "truth which abideth for ever." The only legitimate method, in the present case, therefore, was to state the doctrines under discussion in what the Author thought the most scriptural manner ; and to support his own statement. If by such a statement his opponent's objections be fairly obviated or evaded, they are answered effectually though not formally ; for the light of truth alone is sufficient to dispel the shades of error. In this way Mr. G.'s main arguments are really "touched ;" and some people think that the touch is like that of Ithuriel's spear.

E. H.

Manchester, April 29, 1814.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE FIRST edition of this useful work was soon out of print, in consequence of the very able manner in which it exhibited Mr. Hare's defence of the grand doctrines of Christianity against the sophistries of SOCINIANISM, urged as the latter were by one of the most virulent advocates of that shifting, low, and desecrating system. The perusal of this PRESERVATIVE has been attended with a Divine blessing, to the conviction of several persons who had no previous relish for the humbling doctrines of the cross,—neither acknowledging the proper Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, nor perceiving the necessity of his efficacious atonement. It has likewise been blessed to the reclaiming of others, who had embraced Deism in its most general and modish form—that of "Unitarianism," as it is sometimes

most cunningly called. The republication of it is now undertaken, at the pressing request of several friends, and especially of those who formerly derived benefit from it, and who are commendably anxious that the instruction which it contains should be still more extensively diffused.

In an interesting conversation which I had with my late friend the author, a few months prior to his decease, he very justly observed, that, in the composition of the work, had he not considered himself bound to give a formal answer to the most prominent of Mr. Grundy's observations, he would in several instances have selected for himself a smoother and less sinuous path, than that which his adversary, an avowed enemy to the cross of Christ, had formed for him; and that he would have displayed the distinguishing doctrines of Primitive Christianity in a connection better suited to their dignity and importance. He possessed all the abilities requisite for the execution of such a design; yet, perhaps, it is more advantageous to the Church of Christ, that Mr. Hare did not feel himself thus at liberty, but was compelled to dislodge, by the force of sound and scriptural reasoning, the plausible and sinister objections of his adversary. In doing this, he has avoided in a manner the most exemplary that personality which is one of the chief modes of Socinian attack, and which is marked in deep and strong lines in all their recent controversial writings. Such conduct, in Socinians, is natural and in character. It is no marvel, that a system of religious belief, ostentatiously raised on the slight foundation of shallow and unhumbled reason, should require the aid of '*that wisdom which descendeth not from above, but which is earthly, sensual, and devilish.*'

Numerous and excellent are the publications that treat, professedly and at large, on the Socinian controversy; in which the authors, unrestrained in the exercise of their choice in the selection of topics, have entertained different views of the relative importance of different scriptural doctrines, and have dilated on some of them in a manner much too general, without descending to what may be deemed several of the needful particulars: other writers, on the contrary, have composed, at the call of duty, able answers to single objections, without glancing at any of those strong and general arguments which are to be found in larger treatises. This volume embraces the excellences of both the methods to which allusion is here made, without partaking of their characteristic deficiencies. In the brevity discernible in some of its parts, there is a fulness sufficient to render the arguments there propounded intelligible to the meanest understanding; and in the more enlarged discussions there is a terseness of expression, which precludes every appearance of verbosity in the style, and such spirit is infused into the composition as prevents the reader from imbibing any feeling allied to tedium. Seldom indeed has the whole of the unchristian scheme of modern Socinianism been so completely dissected in all its parts, and so successfully exposed, as it is in this PRESERVATIVE. The nature of the

work required, that the author should occasionally state the general arguments under each division, as a kind of strong foundation on which to raise the particular arguments which, in the course of the discussion, the objections of his opponent might demand. While answering one of these, Mr. Hare has frequently stated, in an abridged form but with much clearness, the chief arguments which had been framed by his learned predecessors in this line of controversy, and has added to them some of his own just views of the same subjects. In this light, the **PRESERVATIVE AGAINST SOCINIANISM** may be regarded as a summary of the main reasons on which the great doctrines of the gospel revelation are supported, and by which they may be defended.

It is a circumstance common to almost all the answers to Socinian writers, that the same texts of scripture are repeated in different parts of the work. They are so adduced, because while one word or clause in a single quotation from the Bible stands as a proof for one doctrine, other words or clauses in the same passage are proofs, equally necessary to be afterwards stated, for the confirmation of other doctrines.

The relict of my deceased friend having done me the honour to confide to my care the republication of this volume, I have been careful to make it an exact reprint of the first edition, which, I scarcely need to add, was found to be very accurately executed, since it had undergone the scrutinizing revision of the lamented author. In this new edition, there is no alteration in any word or form of expression; but, throughout the volume, the language of the author is most scrupulously preserved. Mr. Hare was a man who had greatly endeared himself to me, by the masterly productions of his genius, by his ministerial exertions, his unaffected manners, the depth of his piety, his acts of disinterested kindness to me on a very trying occasion, and by the most tender and convincing proofs of real friendship. Having entertained a strong attachment to him while I had the happiness of enjoying the benefit of his converse, I am naturally anxious that he should live in the grateful regards of the present generation and in the good opinion of posterity. It affords me therefore a high gratification to see such ample justice done to his excellent memory by the Rev. JOSEPH BENSON, that eminently pious and venerable friend, who knew him from his boyhood, and who, since writing the edifying Memoir which is prefixed to the volume of Mr. Hare's **PULPIT REMAINS**, has himself been taken to his great and eternal reward, after a life of immense labour and extensive usefulness.

I have yet to fulfil another (and that not the least important) part of my duty as editor, which is, to implore the Divine Blessing on this treatise. May, therefore, this good work, by the blessing of God, be made yet more eminently successful in confirming believers and in convincing gainsayers!

London, May 1, 1821.

THE EDITOR.

CONTENTS.

PREFACE	3
CHAPTER I.	
Of the Impossibility of attaining to the Knowledge of Divine Things, by Reason without Revelation	9
CHAPTER II.	
Of the Impropriety of making Human Reason the Test of the Doctrines of Divine Revelation	25
CHAPTER III.	
Of the Existence of the Devil	40
CHAPTER IV.	
Of the Unity of God	64
CHAPTER V.	
Of the Pre-existence and Divinity of Jesus Christ	67
CHAPTER VI.	
Of the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit	102
CHAPTER VII.	
Of the Scriptural Doctrine of the Trinity	123
CHAPTER VIII.	
Of the Origin of the doctrine of the Trinity.	133
CHAPTER IX.	
Of the Scriptural Use of the Doctrine of the Trinity.	168
CHAPTER X.	
Of the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Death of Jesus Christ	174
CHAPTER XI.	
Of the Eternity of the Future Punishment of the Wicked	213
CHAPTER XII.	
Of the Divine Inspiration of the Sacred Writings	257
CHAPTER XIII.	
Of the Fallen State of Mankind	285
CHAPTER XIV.	
Of the Miraculous Conception of Jesus Christ.	331
CHAPTER XV.	
Of the Ordinary Influence of the Holy Spirit	368
CHAPTER XVI.	
The Conclusion	409

A

PRESERVATIVE

AGAINST THE

Errors of Socinianism.

CHAPTER I.

Of the impossibility of attaining to the knowledge of Divine Things by Reason without Revelation.

IT IS one of the disadvantages to be encountered in the present discussion, that while the evangelical party take *only* the scriptures for their guide, the Socinians claim it as a privilege to appeal from the sacred writers to the dictates of unassisted reason. The latter will submit their opinions to the test of scripture, only when the scriptures will stand the ordeal of their opinions. Or, to speak with greater propriety, they choose to try rather the scriptures by their creed, than their creed by the scriptures. When the language of the Evangelists and Apostles appears to favour their hypothesis, they are prepared to make the utmost use of its authority ; but when the contrary is the case, and the plainest declarations of the sacred writers can, by no “cogging of the dice,” be transformed into metaphor, allegory, or figurative representation,—when the primitive Teachers of Christian truth obstinately refuse to become *Socinians*, or even to be *neutral*, our opponents are prepared to pronounce against them a sentence of excommunication, and to erase their testimony from the record, as an interpolation, a corruption of the sacred text, or an inconclusive argument.

B

On this important subject, Mr. G. has fully delivered himself. His language is as follows: "Grant only (what none I imagine will deny) that the bestowment of *reason* upon man was, *in itself*, a *partial* revelation of the nature, attributes, and will of God, and then say, whether it be possible that a subsequent more complete revelation should contradict the first."*

The advocates of the *infallibility* of human reason in things divine, would do well to acquaint themselves more exactly with the power and the province of the faculty which they so *unreasonably* exalt. The doctrine of *innate ideas* has been long and justly exploded. But, if the mind (or reason) of man possesses no *innate* ideas, from whence does it collect the first principles of knowledge? From *sensation*, *experience*, and *instruction*. Infants obtain their first and imperfect ideas from what they perceive by their external *senses*. These first ideas are rectified by *experience*. Having in this way received a variety of ideas, and having learnt to distinguish the different sounds which they hear, they are next *taught* to imitate those sounds, and to make each of them the sign of a distinct idea. They are thus prepared for further *instruction*; and by *instruction*, they obtain all their additional knowledge. They are *instructed* in the knowledge of first *principles*. They are *taught* even the *use* of reason; and by *instruction* are led on to those further degrees of knowledge which are acquired by rational deduction. Why do we appoint *instructors* to our children, if they have the *rudiments* of all needful knowledge within themselves? The universal practice of mankind, founded on universal experience, yea even the practice and experience of Mr. G. who, in his way, is taking so much pains to instruct and to guide our reason, amounts to a demonstration of what is here asserted. The *personal* experience of every man speaks the same language. Let any one make the experiment, whether he can, by the utmost exertion of his reason, *create* one new idea in addition to those which he has received by sensation and instruction.

* Sermon on Christianity, an Intellectual and Individual Religion.

Every man may be conscious that he at first relied on the *testimony* of others, and was then *tought* to reason on those principles which he had thus imbibed. The eye of reason, like the eye of the body, is by its Maker formed capable of perceiving and distinguishing the objects which are suited to its nature, *when they are laid before it* in a proper light. But until those objects are so proposed to it, it can no more perceive or distinguish them, than the bodily eye can see what is not presented to it, or, which is the same thing, what is presented in midnight darkness. As the mind cannot reason without ideas, it has no more power to *create* them than to create an atom. Man is a dependent being. God only is his own instructor, (if there be no impropriety in applying that expression to the eternal mind,) and he only has the ideas and archetypes of all things in himself.

The vanity of all the enquiries of mankind after wisdom, divine wisdom, and spiritual understanding, until God is pleased to reveal it, is finely exemplified in Job xxviii. Exactly similar to the doctrine of that beautiful chapter, is the uniform doctrine of the scriptures. They declare that, as to the things of God, mankind are in a state of entire ignorance until they are taught by divine revelation; and always impute the knowledge which mankind receive, to instruction from above. Take the following passages as a sufficient specimen.—“*Every man is brutish in his knowledge.**—He that *teacheth* man *knowledge*.—The Lord knoweth the *thoughts* of man, that they are *vanity*.—Blessed is the man whom thou chastenest, O *LORD*, and *teachest* him out of thy law.†—But there is a spirit in man, and the *inspiration* of the Almighty giveth them *understanding*.‡—Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us *by his Spirit*.||—The *day-spring* from on high hath visited us, to give *light* to them that sit in *darkness*, and in the *shadow* of *death*.§—I had *not known* sin, but by the *law*: for I had *not known* lust, except the *law* had said,

* Jer. x. 14.

+ Psalm xciv. 10—12.
|| 1 Cor. ii. 9, 10.

‡ Job xxxii. 8.

§ Luke i. 78, 79.

Thou shalt not covet.*—How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? So then *faith* cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the *word* of God.—I was found of them that sought me not, I was made *manifest* unto them that *asked not* after me.”†

However unwilling modern philosophers, who have received all their *true* wisdom from the *Bible*, may be to confess the insufficiency of human reason in things divine, the sages of antiquity were honest enough to acknowledge the uncertainty of its researches.

Pythagoras changed the name of wise men into *lovers* of wisdom, as believing it not to be attained by *human* means. Socrates often repeated, “That he knew but one thing with certainty, and that was his *ignorance* of all things.” Plato frequently reminds his pupils, that in religious subjects they were not to expect *proof*, but only probability from them. Aristotle condemns his predecessors as the most foolish and vain-glorious persons in the world, from a conviction of their *ignorance*, and the vanity of imagining that he had carried philosophy to the utmost perfection it was capable of; though no one said or believed less of *divine* things than he did. Tully complains that we are blind in the discernment of wisdom; that some unaccountable error, and miserable ignorance of the truth, has got possession of us. The Stoics pretended to know all things; yet Plutarch says, “That there neither had been, nor was a wise man on the face of the earth.” Lactantius observes, “They could not exceed the powers of nature, nor speak truth on these (sacred) subjects, having never learned it of him who alone could instruct them; nor ever came so near it, as when they confessed their ignorance of it.” Epictetus found so much uncertainty in divine things, that like many other heathen philosophers, he advised every one to follow the custom of his country.‡

* Rom. vii. 7. † Rom. x. 14, 17, 20. ‡ Dr. Ellis on the Knowledge of Divine Things.

Socrates told Aleibiades, “ It is necessary you should wait for some person to teach you how you ought to behave yourself, towards both the gods and men. He (says he) will do it who takes a true care of you. But methinks as we read in Homer, that as Minerva dissipated the mist that covered Diomedes, and hindered him from distinguishing God and man, so it is necessary that he should, in the first place, scatter the darkness that covers your soul, and afterwards give you those remedies that are necessary to put you in a condition of discerning good and evil ; for, at present, you know not how to make a difference.”* “ Plato wished for a prophet to reveal the will of God to us, without which we cannot know it. And Plutarch says the same, that the knowledge of the gods can be had only from them.” Thus did they plainly attribute whatever they knew of the gods, or of divine things, to no principle but the gods. †

The prospect of finding divine truth by the exertions of unassisted reason, will now appear gloomy. But the confidence of rational Christians is not so easily abashed, as is that of rational heathens. That we may enter into a more minute examination of the pretensions of this boasted power, let us enquire :

1. Can we by the exertions of unassisted reason find out the being and perfections of God ?

When Hiero, tyrant of Syracuse, asked the philosopher Simonides that important question, “ What is God ?” the prudent philosopher required a day to consider it, and doubled his request, whenever he was called upon to give in his answer. When Hiero was weary of procrastination, and enquired the reason of this delay ;—“ because,” said the philosopher, “ the longer I consider the subject, the more I am at a loss for a reply.”

Such were the modesty and diffidence of Simonides ! One who was much more justly reputed for wisdom, exclaimed, “ O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God ! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out ! ”—Canst

* Stanley’s Lives. † Dr. Ellis on the Knowledge of Divine Things.
‡ Rom. xi. 33.

thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? It is as high as heaven: what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea. But vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt." * The labour, however, has always been useless: "the world *by wisdom knew not God.*" † Among those who have not seen the dawn of divine revelation, "there is *none* that *understandeth*, that seeketh after, God." ‡—For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." ||

Suppose a person whose powers of argumentation are improved to the utmost pitch of human capacity, but who has received no idea of the existence or attributes of God by any revelation, whether from tradition, scripture, or inspiration; how is he to convince himself *that God is?* and from whence is he to learn *what God is?* That of which, as yet, he knows *nothing*, cannot be a subject of his thought, his reasonings, or his conversation. "He that answereth a matter, before he heareth it, it is folly and shame to him." He can neither affirm nor deny, till he know what is to be affirmed or denied. It never will, it never can, enter into his mind to enquire whether there be a God, till he have heard of such a being, or have formed some conception of him. "The mind," says Mr. Locke, "in all its thoughts and reasonings, hath no other immediate object but its own *ideas*: so that *all* our knowledge is conversant about *them*." § Wherever we want ideas our reasoning stops: we are at the end of our reckoning." ¶ The question then is, From whence must our supposed philosopher derive, in the *first* instance, his idea of the infinite Being, concerning the reality of whose existence he is, in the *second* instance, to decide? Will a close inspection of every part of the visible creation inspire him with the vast idea of an *incorporeal, invisible, unbeginning, everlasting, immutable, and infinitely perfect Spirit?*

* Job xi. 7, 9, 12

|| 1 Cor. vi. 11.

† 1 Cor. i. 21.

§ Lib. 4, chap. i. sec. 1.

‡ Rom. iii. 11.

¶ Lib. 4, chap. 17. sec. 9.

Will the idea of *matter* suggest an idea of *immateriality*? Not unless to one who is in the habit of reasoning by the rule of contraries. And when the idea of *immateriality* is struck out of *matter*, what is it but a *negative* idea: that is, an idea of *nothing*? The *positive* idea of spirit is still wanting.

Will the idea of *one's self* suggest the idea of *spirit*? This question scarcely needs to be proposed to a Socinian who holds the doctrine of Materialism. Neither the idea of body, nor the consciousness which he has of thinking, reasoning, comparing, judging and deciding—in a word, neither his intellect nor his will, conveys to him the idea of spirit. Those who know that “there is a spirit in man,” might pardon this ignorance of the Socinians, if the latter had no opportunity of reading the Bible, when the great metaphysician Locke could attain no idea of spirit but from revelation. “For he who will give himself leave to consider freely, (says he,) will scarce find his reason able to determine him fixedly for or against the soul's immateriality: it being impossible for us, by the contemplation of our own ideas *without revelation*, to discover whether omnipotence has not given to some systems of matter, fitly disposed, a power to perceive and think.”*

But if we suppose it possible for a person who is a perfect stranger to every part of divine revelation, and to all traditional notices of truths originally discovered by revelation, to infer from his own experience that he is himself a spirit, united with a certain portion of matter, and perceiving and acting by bodily organs; how can this inference suggest the idea of a spirit wholly unconnected with matter, and having no bodily organs whereby to perceive or act? Cicero affirms, that “a *pure* mind, thinking, intelligent, and *free from body*, was altogether *inconceivable*.† Created spirits, separate from body, are *supposed* not to be known; and indeed, if they do exist, do not come under our notice.

The whole *visible* world, with the myriads of ideas with which it furnishes us, however those various ideas may be

* Lib. 10, chap. 2, sec. 6.

† Nat. Deor

compounded, can never suggest one idea of what is in its nature *invisible*. Ten thousand beings, *beginning* and *ending*, existing by *succession* and *succeeding each other*, could never lead to the idea of a being who is “*from everlasting to everlasting*,” and “*with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning*.” To see *imperfection* and *mutability*, in every thing around, could never lead us, by any train of thinking, to the idea of a being who is *absolutely perfect*, and to whom *no change is possible*. In a word:—“*Every thing about us being finite*, we have none but *finite* ideas, and it would be an act of omnipotence to stretch them to *infinite*.”

2. If, unaided by revelation, we can trace neither God nor separate spirit, is it possible for us to trace the Devil? If the Devil be a “*deceiver*,” no wonder that mankind should be *deceived* with respect to his existence and operations. If Satan be “*the prince of darkness*,” he will not make himself manifest. It is no more wonder that Mr. G. cannot see a devil, than that he cannot see darkness; for “*that which maketh manifest is light*.”

3. But suppose the existence of a God, the author of all good, and of a Devil, the author of evil, to be already known; how, without divine revelation, can reason assure us that, when a man has rebelled against God, and yielded himself to the influence of the Devil, God will pardon his rebellion and rescue him from the tyranny of that usurper? It cannot be argued as the *necessary* result of the divine perfections; for such a supposition would prove too much. If God *must of necessity* pardon the criminal; for precisely the same reason, he *cannot* possibly have been ever displeased. If he *must of necessity* remit the punishment of the crime; for the same reason, *no* punishment was ever due. In a word: If he *must of necessity* rescue the prisoner, and restore him to himself; for the same reason, he *never could* permit him to depart, or the Devil to gain any advantage against him.

The pardon and salvation of a sinner must depend entirely on the “*good pleasure* of the *will of God*,” who “*will have mercy on whom he will have mercy*, and *will have*

compassion on whom he *will* have compassion." They *cannot* be necessary; they *must* be arbitrary. If they are *not* necessary, they cannot be positively proved from his perfections; and if they are *arbitrary*, they cannot be known to us, unless he be pleased to reveal them. "For who hath known the mind of the Lord; or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him? and it shall be recompensed to him again." *

We cannot, from the experience which we have of his goodness in supplying our wants, and in providing antidotes to many of the evils of human life, conclusively argue, that he is willing to *forgive* our *sins*, and to heal our *mental* diseases. To reason thus, is to found an *universal* proposition upon a *particular* one. It is to argue from the *less* to the *greater*. This is not properly argument, but presumption. "These," we might rather say, "are *parts* of his ways, but *how little a portion is heard of him?* but the thunder of his power *who can understand?*" † Beside this: a man might, with greater precision, argue, that he who lives in the wilful commission of sin, in so doing abuses all the benefits which he receives, and aggravates his sin in proportion to the goodness which he abuses; and that thus he may possibly throw all the weight of the argument which is adduced to prove God's pardoning mercy, into the scale of divine justice. Mercies *abused* can never shew the probability of the forgiveness of the abuse. Again: It is not true that God has provided antidotes to *all* our bodily diseases: or, which is the same thing, we do not know of such provision. Many of the disorders of the human body are incurable and mortal; and therefore it follows analogically, that it is at least possible, for any thing that reason can find to the contrary, that some of our *mental* diseases have no antidote, and may prove destructive.

If reason cannot assure us that God will shew mercy to the transgressors of his law, it must be impossible for us, without a declaration of his will, to ascertain *on what terms* he will forgive and save us. The terms of his mercy will

* Rom. xi. 34, 35.

† Job xxvi. 14.

not be such as a criminal would suggest or chuse. The wickedness of such a one is proof that he has but mean ideas of the divine perfections, and that he has not a proper sense of the honour which is due to the Most High. The *offended*, and not the *offender*, must fix on the terms of reconciliation. Here, therefore, reason will again be at a loss. Repentance and reformation may appear to the eye of reason to be necessary to this end; but it cannot, without unreasonable partiality, be assumed that they will certainly be accepted. In a thousand cases repentance does not repair the damage which has been done by sin. When a man has ruined his fortune and his constitution by his profligacy, can he repair them by mere repentance and reformation? When a man has hurt the reputation, the property, the body, or the mind, of his neighbour, what atonement can he make by repentance and reformation? In like manner, when a man has, by his transgressions, robbed, dishonoured, and grieved the Almighty, what recompense does he render to his Maker by a discontinuance of his former practices? Is it beyond contradiction clear, that God is honoured by our amendment as much as he was dishonoured by our sin? that reformation restores to *him* the benefits which we have abused? that repentance is pleasing to him in the full proportion in which wickedness is displeasing? Can a penitent sinner do more than give to God all his heart, and devote to him all the residue of his life? and would not thus much have been due from him, if he had never revolted? Repentance and reformation then, can, by no form of argumentation, be proved to be all that is demanded in order to our being forgiven and restored. “The word of reconciliation,” alone, can inform us how God can “be just and the justifier” of a penitent sinner. “His thoughts are not our thoughts, neither are his ways our ways: for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are his ways higher than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts.”* The “way of the Lord” can only be understood from divine revelation, in which he “has made known unto us the *mystery* of his *will*, accord-

* Isa. Iv. 8,9.

ing to his good pleasure which he had purposed in himself.” *

4. There is still another subject connected with the present controversy, on which reason is utterly silent: the duration of future punishment.

Reason cannot assure us of a *future* state of existence. It cannot ascertain the *immortality of the soul*. The great reasoners of heathen antiquity thought the immortality of man only *probable*. Socrates stands the foremost as its advocate. But was he able to convince his friends of the truth of it? Nay, was he himself thoroughly convinced? We appeal to the famous conclusion of his speech to his judges: “But now, it is true, we should all retire to our respective offices, you to live, and I to die. But whether you or I are going upon the better expedition, is known to none but God.” An attentive reader of Plato’s Dialogues may discover in them a great deal of inconclusive reasoning on this subject. “I have,” says Cicero, “perused Plato, with the greatest diligence and exactness, over and over again: but know not how it is, whilst I read him I am convinced; when I lay the book aside, and begin to consider by myself of the soul’s immortality, all the conviction instantly ceases.” † “If, after all, I am mistaken in my belief of the soul’s immortality, I am pleased with my *error*.” ‡ Such was the uncertainty in which, on this important subject, the strongest minds were held!

Human reason, when the question is agitated, may suggest many arguments which render it *probable*, that this is not our final state; but *certainty* from that source is *impossible*. That which had a *beginning* may probably have an *end*. “Had the soul a natural immortality, the origin of life in itself, it could never cease to be; it would be *God*.” But, like all created beings, it is dependent on its Creator, “in whom it lives, and moves, and has its being.” It is therefore dependent on the sovereign *will* of him who sees the possibility “that the spirit should fail before him, and the souls which he has made.” ||

* Eph. i. 9. † Tusc. 2. lib. 1. n. 11. ‡ De Senect. || Isa. lvii. 16.

And from whence can reason infer how long it is the *will* of God to prolong the existence of the human soul? That he has designed it for an eternal, or even for a future state of existence, cannot be inferred from its *nature*, the *growth* of its *faculties*, its *abhorrence of annihilation*, or its *desire of existence*. By the *nature* of the soul, I mean its *immateriality*. But reason does not uniformly perceive that it *is* immaterial. Who can argue with greater precision than the Socinians? Yet many of them are thoroughly convinced that their souls are no other than mere *matter*. These cannot argue, that because the human soul is immaterial, it is immortal. All their hope is the resurrection of the body. But suppose the soul to be a spirit, and that some philosophers are aware that a spirit is immaterial; can it be fairly and confidently affirmed that it is therefore immortal? Its immateriality renders it impossible that it should be destroyed by a dissolution of its parts; for that which is immaterial has *no* parts. But how does it appear that there is *no* method of annihilation, but dissolution? Because the soul cannot perish by the *same* means by which the body dies; does it follow that it is immortal?—The immortality of the soul cannot be inferred from the *growth* of its *faculties*. We see human bodies in a state of progressive improvement till they arrive at a certain point, beyond which they speedily decline, and sooner or later perish. And how shall we ascertain that there is not a fixed point beyond which the human mind is incapable of improvement: a zenith which it passes, and then makes haste to set in darkness?—Its *abhorrence of annihilation*, and its *desire of perpetual existence*, cannot prove to us its endless duration. In truth, the abhorrence of annihilation, and the desire of immortality, are neither so universal, nor so uniform, as those who triumph in the argument adduced from them, assume. But if they *were* universal and uniform, they, in this case, prove nothing. How many evils which we abhor, befall us! and how few of our desires are gratified! Who would infer that he shall never want, because he shrinks at the thought of poverty? or that he shall one day be a king, because his head itches for a diadem? This argument

would just as well convince us of the immortality of the body, as of that of the soul.

Again : Reason cannot assure us of the future *resurrection of the body*. The heathens did not place this hope of the Christian even among probabilities : nay some of them thought it impossible. "God," says Pliny, "cannot do all things, neither recall the dead, nor make mortal creatures immortal." Hence, when St. Paul preached to the Stoies and Epicureans at Athens, they treated him as "a setter forth of new Gods, because he preached to them Jesus and the *resurrection* ;" and would hear no more from one who could be guilty of mentioning such an absurdity. And who can wonder at the error of those who "knew not the Scriptures, neither the power of God ?" Which of us has seen a dead body revive ? What is there left in a rotten carcase, the dust of which is scattered before the winds of heaven, to lead us to look for a resuscitation ? "Can these dry bones live ? Lord, thou knowest." And who besides knows, unless the Lord of life have been pleased to give some intimation of his purpose ? We can indeed reason on this subject from *analogy*. We see that day uniformly follows night ; and therefore argue that the night of death may be followed by the morning of a resurrection. Very true ; it *may* ; but is it evident from hence that it *shall* ? Might not one, with equal propriety, attempt, in this way, to prove an endless succession of sleeping and waking, of dying and reviving ? Again : every spring produces a resurrection in the vegetable world, from whence some men of great name infer that there will at length be a resurrection in the animal world : and the Apostle's allusion to a grain of wheat, which "is not quickened except it die," is thought to give countenance to the argument and to prove its validity. Now, not to say that it is but a lame argument which wants a proof to support it, is it not plain that St. Paul makes use of that allusion, not to *demonstrate*, but to *illustrate*, a future resurrection ? If it be an argument, the following is well adapted to destroy it. "There is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease : though the root thereof was

old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground : yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant. But man dieth, and wasteth away : yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?"

Now if it is impossible for human reason to decide on a future state of existence, or to point out the term of that existence, it cannot determine the *duration* of the *future punishment of the wicked*. To say nothing of the partiality of a man in his own cause, or of the unwillingness of a criminal to sign his own death-warrant, it is not possible for him, however he may be disposed, to assign the nature and duration of the punishment which he has deserved. To do this, he must "know the Almighty to perfection." He must be able to discern, as well as willing to acknowledge, what is due from the intelligent and accountable creatures of God, to the divine majesty, purity, justice, and goodness. Unless he can comprehend thus much, he has no *data* on which to ground his decision of this important question, and must therefore refer it to that gospel in which "the wrath of God is revealed against all ungodliness, and unrighteousness."

Should that knowledge of divine things, which, after all, the wiser heathens confessedly possessed, render it doubtful whether reason be so inadequate to the attainment of it, as has been represented ; it will be necessary to add that they enjoyed the partial and imperfect light of a remote revelation. The Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had frequent divine communications ; and Joseph, who indubitably learned much from his progenitors, was no stranger to them. While the latter reigned in Egypt, much valuable light would be diffused among the inhabitants of that country. The Egyptians would make considerable improvement in divine knowledge during the captivity of Israel, and not a little by the miraculous deliverance. The Greeks studied wisdom in Egypt ; and afterwards imparted it to the Romans. As the Israelites were appointed the "witnesses" of JEHOVAH, some small measure of divine knowledge emanated from them, and was shed on the nations more immediately surrounding them. Thus it was that the

sages of antiquity obtained, not from reason, but from revelation, their best maxims, and their most valuable knowledge. And thus “every good and perfect gift” may be traced up to “the *Father of lights.*”

It will very probably be objected, that the scriptures refer us to the *works* of God, that from those works we may learn the knowledge of God, and be led by the creatures to the Creator.

When God has declared himself to men, he justly appeals to his works as vouchers for the character which he has given of himself, and of the wisdom, power, and goodness in which he would teach them to trust. But unless the idea of a God lead mankind to consider the creatures as the *works of his hands*, his works would never lead them to him. It is not by *reason*, but “by *faith*, we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God.”* To make appeals to the works of God, as independent proofs of his existence, among those to whom a verbal revelation was addressed, were unnecessary. That the Old Testament is full of appeals to the works of God, is too obvious to be called in question. But on close examination, the true reason for those appeals will be found to be this: The nations who surrounded the Israelites were, without exception, worshippers of idols; and the *God of Israel* wished to be distinguished from all the objects of their worship as “*Je-hovah*, who made the heavens, and the earth, and all things therein.” On this account, the Jews were taught to sing, “The heavens declare the *glory of God*, and the firmament sheweth his *handy-work*.”

It may be worth while, however, to spend a moment in the consideration of one part of the New Testament, in which it is generally supposed that St. Paul appeals to the works of God as proofs of the *being* of God. The passage alluded to, which we will examine as we proceed, is the following: “That which may be known of God is manifest in (or among) them (the Gentiles); for God *hath shewed* it unto them.” Here we see that God had given to them some knowledge of himself. He had not left them to the

* Heb. xi. 3.

instructions of unassisted reason. “ For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world, (i. e. from the beginning) are clearly seen, being *understood* (not *demonstrated*) by the things that are made, even (not his existence, but) his eternal *power* and *Godhead*; so that they are without excuse. Because that (instead of finding out God when they knew him not,) when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. — Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.” And thus the things that are made, and from which the eternal power and Godhead of Him who had shewed himself to them, might have been reflected, were, by these professors of wisdom, made the objects of their worship. Instead of leading them to him, they had led them wholly away from him.

CHAPTER II.

On the Impropriety of making Human Reason the Test of the Doctrines of Divine Revelation.

HAVING removed the rotten foundation of *Socinianism*, we may now, at our leisure, pile up and burn the “wood, hay, and stubble,” which have been built upon it. The unreasonable pretensions which are erected on Mr. G.’s first position, are as follow :

“ To what end was reason given? precisely, that it might be the rule of life; the helm by which we must steer our course across the tempestuous billows of mortality; the touchstone of every doctrine; the supreme umpire in every difficulty and doubt. ‘ Try the spirits,’ says the apostle John, try their doctrines, ‘ whether they be of God.’ By what are they to be tried, unless reason in every instance is to be their judge?” *

When Mr. G. says that reason is the *helm* by which we are to steer, the supreme *umpire* in every difficulty and doubt, and the *Judge* in every trial, he has hit the truth more “ *precisely* ” than he perhaps intended. But this grave *Judge* wants a *touchstone*; this supreme *umpire* wants a *rule* by which infallibly to decide. A *helm* is certainly a necessary thing for steering a ship, whether “ *across* the tempestuous billows,” or *before* them. But surely something more than a *helm* is necessary to those who would cross the pathless deserts of the deep. If Mr. G. were turned adrift, a hundred leagues from land, when neither sun nor stars appear, without a chart, without a compass, and without a pilot, he would find that a *helm* alone is but a useless thing; and would well enough exemplify the folly and madness of those philosophical theologians who make divine revelation

* Sermon on Christianity an intellectual and individual Religion, p. 10.

bow before human reason. Or, if he would condescend to embark with those who understand the art of spiritual navigation a little better than himself, he might probably learn, that while *Socinian Landmen* throw their charts overboard, and nail their compass down to the point on which they have resolved to steer, because their helms-man is a *lubber*; the *Orthodox Mariners* learn the course which they are to steer, *only* from their *chart*, *use* their *compass* to *direct* them on the course which is thus prescribed, and oblige their *helms-man*, though “a Seaman every inch of him,” to *steer*, not according to his own *whims*, but according to the *directions* of their *Pilot*.

It is not “*precisely*” the same thing to assert that reason is the “*rule*” by which reason, the “*Judge*,” must “try the spirits;” or, that it is the “*touchstone of every doctrine*,” by which this “*supreme umpire*” is “*in every difficulty and doubt*” to decide. Mr. G. has made a gross mistake in calling St. John as an evidence of the propriety of making reason “*the touchstone of every doctrine*.” “Beloved,” says the Apostle, “believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.” Thus he makes reason the “*Judge*” in this question, but by no means the “*touchstone*” by which it is to be tried. He gives us a *scriptural test*, and teaches us to bring every doctrine to the *touchstone of revealed truth*. “*Hereby know ye the Spirit of God. Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God.*”*

That “neither Jesus Christ nor his Apostles rejected reason” as the *Judge*, we readily grant. And this, as the slightest examination of Mr. G.’s quotations will shew, is all that he has proved. Who but himself would have thought that Jesus Christ taught us to appeal *from the scriptures* to the “*touchstone*” of *reason*, when, on a subject of *pure revelation*, he said to the Jews, “Search the *scriptures*; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and *they* (not reason) are they which testify of me?”† Equally distant

* 1 John iv. 1—3.

† John v. 39.

from the point to be proved, is the text which he has cited from St. Paul, and which, taken in connection with the context, runs thus: “Wherefore, my dearly beloved, flee from idolatry. I speak as to wise men, *judge ye* what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?”* Here the Apostle appeals, not to *reason*, but to the institution and design of the Lord’s supper, which is a doctrine of *pure revelation*. Unless therefore Mr. G. can prove, that grounding an argument on the infallible testimony of divine *revelation*, is the same thing as to submit the doctrine of revelation to the “*touchstone*” of *reason*, he will gain nothing. Once more, however, let us hear him on this point. He seems to think the question decided by that saying of St. Paul, “Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.” Without supposing it necessary to make any alteration in the translation, may it not be asked, How does it appear from hence, that the Apostle teaches the Corinthians to try the doctrines of scripture by the “*touchstone*” of human *reason*? or that he would have the full persuasion which he recommends, to be the result of *argumentation*, rather than of a more perfect knowledge of what is required by the *word of God*? While Mr. G. answers this question, we proceed to remark that St. Paul is speaking of the observance of Jewish festivals: A point this, on which revelation *only* could decide. And the Apostle chose rather to inculcate brotherly affection, than to encounter the harmless prejudices of either of the parties in this dispute. Some persons, in conformity with the context, make a slight alteration in the translation, and read the whole passage thus: “Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up; for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. *Let every one* (*εν τωιωνα και οποιησεις*) *abound in his own sense;*” for it is a matter of pure indifference. “He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.”†

* 1 Cor. x. 14—16.

† Rom. xiv. 4—6.

The fallacy of this common Socinian argument lies in the *confusion* of the *terms*. Mr. G. has heaped together the words “*judge*” and “*rule*,” “*umpire*” and “*touchstone*,” and fancies that because he has proved reason to be the proper “*judge*,” he has equally proved, that, in opposition to the divine testimony, reason is also the “*touchstone*” of truth. Such is the *infallibility* of Socinian *reason*!

It is now *our* turn to appeal to the authority of the sacred writers. The following citations will be more than enough to prove that, in matters of religion, mere *human wisdom* is *fully*;—that it is an obstacle to the wisdom which cometh from *above*;—that the wisdom taught by *reason*, ought to give place to that which is taught by *revelation*;—and that to mingle *human wisdom* with the wisdom of *God*, is like blending *darkness* with *light*, or *poison* with *food*.

“ Christ sent me to preach the gospel; not with *wisdom of words*, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that *perish, foolishness*; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God. For it is written, I will *destroy* the *wisdom* of the *wise*, and will *bring to nothing* the *understanding* of the *prudent*. *Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world?* hath not God made *foolish* the *wisdom* of this world? For after that, in the *wisdom of God*, the world *by wisdom knew not God*, it pleased God, by the *foolishness of preaching*, to save them that *believe*. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after *wisdom*: but we preach Christ crucified, nnto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks, *foolishness*; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the *wisdom of God*. Because the *foolishness of God* is *wiser* than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many *wise* men after the flesh;—but God hath chosen the *foolish* things of the world, to *confound* the *wise*, —that no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus who of God is made unto us *wisdom*, &c. that according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. And I brethren, when I came to you,

came not with excellency of speech, or of *wisdom*, declaring unto you the *testimony of God*. For I determined *not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified*. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of *man's wisdom*, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power. That your faith should not stand in the *wisdom of men*, but in the power of God. Howbeit, we speak *wisdom* among them that are perfect, yet not the *wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this world, that come to nought*. But we speak the *wisdom of God*, in a *mystery*, even the *hidden wisdom* which *God ordained* before the world unto our glory: which *none of the princes of this world knew*; for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written, *Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man* the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But *God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit*.—*The things of God knoweth no man*, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the *Spirit of the world*, but the *Spirit which is of God*; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which *man's wisdom teacheth*; but which the *Holy Ghost teacheth*; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the *natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*; for they are *foolishness* unto him, *neither can he know them*, because they are spiritually discerned. For who hath known the mind of the Lord; that he may instruct him? but we have the mind of Christ.*—Do not err, my beloved brethren. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the FATHER of LIGHTS. Wherefore, my beloved brethren, let every man be swift to hear, slow to speak.†—Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise. For the *wisdom of this world is foolishness with God*; for it is written, He taketh the *wise* in their own *craftiness*. And again, The Lord knoweth the *thoughts of the wise* that they are *vainglory*. Therefore let no man glory in *men*.‡—Let *God be true*, but

* 1 Cor. i. and ii.

† James i. 16, 17, 19.

‡ 1 Cor. iii. 18.—21.

every man a liar: as it is written, That thou mightest be *justified* in thy *sayings*, and mightest *overcome* when thou art *judged*. *—To the *law*, and to the *testimony*: if *they speak not according to this word*, it is because there *is no light in them*. †—*Foolish and unlearned questions* avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. ‡—Charge them before the Lord, that they strive not about *words* to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers. Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the *word of truth*. But shun *profane and vain babblings*, for they will increase unto more ungodliness. And their *word* will eat as doth a canker. ||— Charge some that they teach *no other doctrine*. § If any man teach *otherwise*, and consent not to *wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is *proud, knowing nothing*, but *doting about questions and strifes of words*, whereof come *perverse disputings* of men of *corrupt minds* and *destitute of the truth*:—from such withdraw thyself. ¶—O Timothy, *keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely so called, which some professing, have erred concerning the faith.* **—Because that when they *knew God*, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became *vain* in their *imtaginations*, and their *foolish heart* was darkened: professing themselves to be *wise*, they became *fools*. ††—For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh; that their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the *full assurance of understanding*, to the *acknowledgment of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge*. And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with *enticing words*. For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the Spirit, *joying and beholding*

* Rom. iii. 4.

† Isaiah viii. 20.

‡ 2 Tim. ii. 23.

|| 2 Tim. ii. 14—17.

§ 1 Tim. i. 3.

¶ 1 Tim. vi. 3—5.

** 1 Tim. vi. 20.

†† Rom. i. 21, 22.

your order, and the *steadfastness* of your *faith in Christ*. As ye have therefore *received* Christ Jesus the Lord, so *walk ye in him*; rooted and built up in him, and *established* in the *faith*, as ye have been *taught*, abounding therein with *thanksgiving*. Beware lest any man *spoil* you through *philosophy* and *vain deceit*, after the *tradition of men*, after the *ruinments of the world*, and *not after Christ*. *—The *law* of the *Lord* is *perfect*, converting the soul; the *testimony* of the *Lord* is *sure*, making *wise* the simple; the *statutes* of the *Lord* are *right*, rejoicing the heart; the *commandment* of the *Lord* is *pure*, *enlightening* the eyes; the *judgments* of the *Lord* are *true*, and *righteous* altogether. †—Mine heart within me is broken because of the prophets; all my bones shake: I am like a drunken man, and like a man whom wine hath overcome, because of the *Lord*, and because of the *words* of his holiness. Thus saith the *Lord* of hosts, Hearken not unto the words of the prophets that prophesy unto you; they *make you vain*: they speak a *vision of their own heart*, and *not out of the mouth of the Lord*. They say still unto them that *despise* me, the *Lord* hath said ye shall have *peace*; and they say unto every one that walketh after the *imagination of his own heart*, No evil shall come upon you. For who hath stood in the *counsel of the Lord*, and hath *perceived* and *heard* his *word*? who hath marked his *word*, and heard it?—I have not *sent* these prophets, yet they *ran*: I have not *spoken* to them, yet they *prophesied*. But if they had stood in *my counsel*, and had caused my people to *hear my words*, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings.—I have heard what the prophets said, that prophesy *lies* in my name, saying, I have *dreamed*, I have *dreamed*. How long shall this be in the hearts of the prophets that prophesy *lies*? yea, they are prophets of the *deceit of their own heart*.—The prophet that hath a *dream*, let him tell a *dream*; and he that hath *my word*, let him speak *my word faithfully*. What is the *chaff* to the *wheat*? saith the *Lord*. Is not my *word* like as a *fire*? saith the *Lord*; and like a *hammer* that breaketh the rocks in

* Col. ii. 1—2.

† Psalm xix. 7—9.

pieces? *—For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the *plagues* that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away *his part out of the book of life*, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are *written* in this book.”†

The language of these passages is so far from being equivoval, that the reader, without the assistance of a commentator, will easily understand them, and make the proper application.

How much cause there is for these warnings, has been exemplified from the times of the Apostles to the present. “The Christian church was scarcely formed, when, in different places, there started up certain pretended reformers, who, not satisfied with the *simplicity* of that religion which was taught by the Apostles, set up a *new* religion drawn from their own *licentious imaginations*. Several of these are mentioned by the Apostles, such as Hymenæus, and Alexander. The influence of these new teachers was but inconsiderable at first. During the lives of the Apostles, their attempts towards the perversion of Christianity were attended with little success. They, however, acquired credit and strength by degrees; and even from the first dawn of the gospel, laid imperceptibly the foundation of those sects which produced afterwards such trouble in the Christian church.

“Among the various sects that troubled the Christian church, the leading one was that of the *Gnostics*. These self-sufficient *philosophers* boasted of their being able to restore mankind to the *knowledge* (*gnosis*) of the Supreme Being, which had been lost in the world. Under the general appellation of Gnostics are comprehended all those who, in the first ages of Christianity, corrupted the doctrine of the gospel by a profane mixture of the tenets of the oriental *philosophy*, with its divine truths.”‡ From these “*know-*

* Jer. xxiii. 9, &c. † Rev. xxii. 18, 19. ‡ Mosheim, Book 1, Part II., Chap. 5.

ing ones" arose, in the first and second century, a rich harvest of heresies and heresies, of which, not to mention them in detail, the reader may find an ample account in the first volume of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History. A few specimens would shew that the Apostles acted wisely when they cautioned their disciples against every thing destructive to the simplicity of the gospel, and that they were not mistaken in the results of this unnatural coalition of philosophy and revelation, which they predicted. "There is no observation capable of fuller proof, than that religion, through all ages of the Christian church, was more or less pure according to the alloy of *philosophy* or *human reason* mixed up with it. There was scarcely an heresy in the primitive church that was not imbibed from Plato's academy, Zeno's portico, or some vain reasonings of the Pagan wise men. In latter ages the schoolmen rejected Plato, and exalted Aristotle into the chair of Christ, says Tilenus; * esteeming him the God of wisdom who could not err. And the controversy long subsisted to which of them an appeal lay for the determination of truth. Such is the vain arrogance of human reason, as to have puffed up some in every age, to promise they would shew us the truth by the mere light of it, and maintain it as the only rule of faith. 'Philosophy and vain deceit' have always proved highly injurious to the purity of religion, and the great objects of *faith* which are supernaturally revealed." †

Since philosophy has fallen into the hands of sincere and devout *Christians*, who valued above all learning "the faith delivered to the saints," and "contended" for that faith as the truest wisdom, it has been much reformed. But so long as it is *human* wisdom, it will never be fit to take the lead of revelation. *Modern* philosophers, as well as those of antiquity, whenever they attempt to model their *creed* by the rule of their reason, shew themselves capable of the greatest absurdities. With our *Unitarian* Divines, (as they are pleased exclusively to denominate themselves,) it is a first principle that "*reason* directs to *whatever* is *true* in speculation." To set Reason free from the fetters of

* Til. Synt. gm. Part II. Di. p. 16. Thes. 31. † Dr. Ellis

education, they have renounced the doctrine of human depravity, and of eternal punishment. Thus inspired with unlimited confidence in their own understanding, and divested of all apprehension of eternal consequences, they are “induced to reason *cautiously* and *frequently*, and to learn to reason *well*.” So says one of themselves.* And what can be more *reasonably* expected from them, than that they should all reason *alike*? But their one, perfect, infallible, and unchangeable guide, which “*directs to whatever is true in speculation*,” is far from leading them all in the same path. A few lines from the Author just mentioned will amply illustrate their agreements and their differences.

“In order to convey a *just* idea of the constitution of Unitarian Societies, it is necessary to premise, that, whilst we are united by a few great principles, there are numerous topics of *inferior* consequence, respecting which we differ in opinion among ourselves. All Unitarians agree in denying that *Jesus Christ* was the eternal God; and that he is the object of religious worship. Some of them, however, believe that he was employed, as an instrument in the hands of the Deity, to create the material world, though not possessed of undervived wisdom and independent power: others believe only in his pre-existence. Some go still farther, maintaining that he was simply a human being, but conceived in the womb of the Virgin according to the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke’s gospels: others see reason to believe that those chapters are interpolations, and therefore deny the doctrine of the miraculous conception. In like manner, all Unitarians agree, that the death of *Christ* was an incalculable blessing to mankind: some, however, do not presume to determine the exact *manner* in which it conduces to the good of men, while others think that the mode of its beneficial operation may be distinctly pointed out; but all reject the Trinitarian doctrines of satisfaction and vicarious atonement, believing, not that Jesus saves his followers from the everlasting

* Mr. James Yates, in a Sermon on the grounds of Unitarian Dissent, preached at Glasgow, pp. 16, 17, 22, 23.

misery to which they are *supposed* to have been doomed in consequence of the sin of their first parents, but that he saves them, by the force of his doctrines, precepts, and example, from vice, ignorance, and superstition, and from the misery which is their natural result. The ordinance of baptism is a subject on which we entertain various opinions: some of us practise the baptism of *infants*, others of *adults*, and some think that the use of water may be omitted entirely. Concerning the question of an Intermediate State, and the philosophical doctrines of Materialism and Necessity, we either remain in doubt, or espouse opposite sides. On these and other points, which have been debated by orthodox Christians with rancorous animosity, we agree to differ.” *

Mr. Yates ought to have the thanks of the Christian world for speaking the *truth*. This curious passage shews that *Reason* as well as *Nature* has her frolics. The “few great principles” in which the Unitarians agree, Mr. Y. has carefully laid down: viz. 1. “The free and unbiassed use of the understanding on religious subjects.—2. They ought to offer prayer and adoration to God, the *Father, only*.—3. They regard holiness of heart, and excellence of conduct, as the *only* means of obtaining salvation.”

These three great Unitarian principles will not prevent the effect of our observations on the passage which we have cited.

There is one part of this exposition of Unitarianism on which we may properly enough remark, before we enter into the heart of it. Mr. Y. has shewn that his friends are not yet agreed on “the philosophical doctrines of *Materialism* and *Necessity*.” But ought they not to know from whence they take their *departure*, when they set out on their voyage of discovery? When Thales, while contemplating the stars, fell into a ditch, “How,” said a woman, “should you know what passes in the heavens, when you see not what is just at your feet?”—Again: ought they not to determine whether or not there is a *spirit* in them, before they assure themselves that they can, without

* Mr. Yates’s Sermon, pp. 13—15.

assistance from above, find out *God* who is a *Spirit*? An Apostle thought, that none but the *spirit* of a man can know what is in *man*. But they think, that without a spirit they can know the things of *God*. If all the phenomena of perception, reason, memory, will, and various affections, joined with the unequivocal and uniform testimony of divine Revelation, cannot assure an Unitarian that he has a *spirit* distinct from his body, how can his reason prove to itself that there is a God who is a *Spirit*? Where then is the *reason*, which is “a partial revelation of God, his nature, attributes, and will?” If a man’s reason be not satisfied on this point, how can he, on Socinian principles, believe the testimony of a revelation which contradicts his reason? Or, if a contradiction be not admitted, how can his reason be a fit *rule* by which to judge whether that doctrine of revelation be true?—This one concession is subversive of the whole fabrie of Socinianism, which is like a kingdom divided against itself.—Once more: ought they not to be assured that their (what name should it have?) spirit is *free*, has *liberty*, and is *not* bound down by the chains of *irresistible necessity*, before they assure themselves that they are entering on a *free* enquiry?

Leaving them to consider how far it is proper to begin their reasonings where they now end them, let us examine the points in which they agree, and those in which they differ.

1. Their *agreement* is all in *negatives*. They are only agreed about what is *not*. They agree in *denying* that Jesus Christ is the eternal God, or the object of religious worship; and in *rejecting* the doctrines of satisfaction and vicarious atonement, as well as the doctrine of original sin, and everlasting punishment. That is, they agree in *renouncing* these doctrines of the bible.

2. But in things *positive*, though led by the same *infallible* guide, “which directs to whatever is *true* in speculation,” they agree *not at all*. They are not agreed whether Jesus Christ was the “instrumental” *Creator of the world*, or a *mere man*. They are not agreed in what *manner* the world is benefited by the death of Christ. They are not agreed

whether baptism (i. e. *washing*) should be administered with or without water! *Risum tenucis?* They are not agreed whether they have an immortal soul; or whether they have any soul at all;—whether they are walking in glorious liberty, or are bound in the adamantine chains of inexorable necessity!—Such are the *consistencies* of all-searching, all-discerning, all-knowing, reason! When men, instead of ascending to heaven on a ladder let down *from above*, agree to build a tower of which the *foundation* shall be on *earth*, and the summit shall reach the *skies*; no wonder that God *confounds* their *language*!

To bring to light this *disagreement* among themselves, was the design with which Mr. Yates was cited. The citation is intended to shew, first,—that as the *heathen philosophers* without the aid of revelation could discover and detect error, but could not find out truth, or *agree* among themselves on that great question, What is truth? and therefore could never enlighten the world by their instructions; so, when *philosophical divines* bring the doctrines of revelation to the *test* of human reason, and make their own conceptions the *rule* by which they are to judge, they can easily agree to discard many points of doctrine which in their own opinion ought *not* to be taught, because they are false, but have among themselves no *positive* revealed truth on which they are agreed, and therefore are as unfit to instruct mankind as their elder brethren: And secondly—that as by the philosophy which some of the first *Christian* teachers adopted, Christianity was *neutralized*; so by the *negative* and *sceptical* philosophy of modern teachers Christianity is *destroyed*.—It is true indeed, while the Socinians differ among themselves in matters which they deem of “*inferior* importance,” they agree in “a few *great* principles;” and it is equally true, that Herod and Pontius Pilate “agreed to differ” in smaller matters, but to unite in the important affair of “crucifying the Lord of glory.”

If then, for creatures of such acknowledged ignorance to profess themselves able to discover the truths of God, is arrogance; to determine them by their own reason, is

profaneness. To do either the one or the other, is more than man is fitted for, or called to : and none has attempted it who has not failed. The gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, it is agreed on both sides, is a revelation from God. It is suited, especially in those parts which most immediately concern us, to the capacity of the meanest. “To the poor,” who are generally illiterate, “the gospel is preached;” yet these “God has chosen, rich in *faith*.” Even “a child may know the Holy scriptures, and be made *wise unto salvation*.” It is not a *veil* thrown over the truth, by forced allegories and strained metaphors ; but a *revelation* of the truth, delivered in proper terms, where proper terms are most intelligible; and in which figures are used only where figures are absolutely necessary, or will give it greater perspicuity and force. “We use,” says the Apostle Paul, “great plainness of speech: and not as Moses, which put a *veil* over his face.—But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commanding ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God. But if our gospel be hid (veiled) it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.”*

It is true, the Gospel has its *mysteries*. It has its *mysteries* revealed: truths which were once kept *secret*, “but now are made *manifest*.” These are properly *mysteries* no longer, and are called so only with respect to what they *once were*. It has its *mysteries* yet *unrevealed*. There are things which we “know not *now*; but shall know *hereafter*.” And it has its *mysteries imperfectly* revealed: revealed so far as we are able to *comprehend* a revelation of them. These are *mysteries* still. “We see them through a glass *darkly* :—we know them but *in part*.”† The gospel does not in every case enable us to answer those questions,—*why?* *how?* *wherefore?* but it teaches us to submit our *understandings* to the *wisdom* of God, and our *hearts* to his *will*. How can a revelation of

* 2 Cor. iii. 12, 13. & iv. 2—4. † 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

the being, perfections, and ways of the *infinite* God, be made to a *finite* creature, without involving *mysteries*? That which is *infinite* cannot be comprehended by that which is *finite*. To suppose that it could, is to suppose that either the former is no longer *infinite*, or the latter is no longer *finite*. In whatever measure, therefore, God is made known to us, that which is known to us must imply something which is *unknown*, that is a *mystery*. It is the part of christian humility to acknowledge, that “seeret things belong unto the Lord our God;” and it is the part of Christian docility to receive with meekness “those things which are revealed” as belonging “to us and to our children for ever.” *

In an examination, like the present, of those things which once were *mysteries*, and of those which are now “*in part*” revealed, while we abstain from all vain and curious inquiries into the *why*, the *how*, and the *wherfore*, which are not revealed; our business is, not to suppose that in the imaginary deductions of human reason we have an infallible standard of judgment already fixed,—which is perfectly incompatible with the idea of those things having been, or being now, *mysteries*; but, to sit, without prejudice or prepossession, at the feet of Christ and of his Apostles, and to learn from *them* what are “*the principal doctrines of Christianity*.”

* Deut. xxix. 29.

CHAPTER III.

Of the Existence of the Devil.

THOUGH the mere *abstract*, philosophical question of the existence of the Devil, is rather curious than useful; to know that we have an invisible and inveterate foe, who makes the seduction of mankind his business, and their destruction his aim, is of great importance.

It is not our purpose to prove that there is an *omnipresent*, *omniscient*, *omnipotent*, *prescient*, and *infinitely* malicious fiend.* Mr. G., for aught we know, may have heard ignorant persons speak as if there were; and it must be confessed, that he has made the best use of their misrepresentations. His attack on this “castle in the air” has afforded him a triumph to which he is heartily welcome. If he can prove nothing else, he can prove that there is not an *infinite* Devil. But all his arguments on this topic are mere waste of words. He has manufactured a man out of the straw of vulgar inaccuracy, and has innocently set it on fire. Leaving him to warm himself by the flame which he has kindled, we proceed to point out what we have learnt on this subject, from the sacred scriptures.

By those divine oracles we are taught, that there are beings *celestial* as well as *terrestrial*: He who created “heaven” and “earth,” created all things “in” them, “visible and invisible,” even “*thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers.*”† These *invisible* inhabitants of heaven are *intelligent* beings; for they “do always *bhold the face of* the Father which is in heaven:”‡ and *moral agents*; for they not only know, but *do* his will, and are set forth as an example to us, who are taught to pray, that his “will

* Lect. Vol. I. pp. 18, 73, 74, 84, 91, 92, 102. † Col. i. 16. ‡ Matt. xviii. 10.

may be done on *earth*, as it is done in *heaven*." They are *spiritual substances*: not clothed with flesh like us; for "he maketh his angels *spirits*." *

These celestial spirits are called *Angels* or *Messengers*, because they have been known to mankind chiefly in the character of *messengers from God*.

From St. Peter and St. Jude, we learn that some of these inhabitants of heaven "abode not in the truth," but fell from their rectitude and bliss. To disturb our enjoyment of the testimony of St. Jude, Mr. G. has given us a specimen of *Socinian* reasoning. "I cannot enter into a critical explanation of every passage. I will refer you to *Simpson's* Essay on the words *Satan* and *Devil*, where the subject is thoroughly investigated. Suffice it now to say that it refers to *human* beings and the punishment *temporal*. It relates to the journey of the *Israelites* through the wilderness, to their rebellion and their subsequent punishment." †

Let us hear by what means Mr. *Simpson* has perverted the sense of the words of the Apostle. In the first place, he has taken the *utmost freedom*, in giving a new version of the passage. We shall not, however, object to this; except in the case of one word, viz. *αἰδοῖς*, which our translators have properly rendered, "*everlasting*." It is from *αεί* "always," and is the word which St. Paul uses in Rom. i. 20. where again it is, and must be, rendered "*eternal*:" ("*eternal power and Godhead*.") It is used by *Ignatius*, in his epistle to the *Magnesians* (sec. 8.) to point out the eternity of *Jesus Christ*, whom he denominates, with respect to *God*, *αὐτὸς λόγος αἰδοῖς*, his *eternal Word*. But Mr. S. to get rid of a word which indicates *eternal*, instead of *temporal*, punishment, has translated it, in connection with the word *δεσμοῖς*, without *assigning any reason*, and *contrary to all authority*, "*the chains of Hades*."—In this case, then, we have a *false translation*.

With this exception, the utmost freedom of translation being allowed, the passage stands thus: "And the (Angels, or) Messengers, who watched not over their principality, but deserted their proper station, he hath reserved until the

* Heb. i. 7.

† Vol. I. p. 73.

judgment of the great day, in everlasting chains, under darkness." Such, with the exception which we have noted, is Mr. S.'s translation, on which we will remark :

1. That the passage is still *perfectly applicable* to our purpose.

2. That the application of it to Mr. G's purpose, is beyond all measure *forced*. (1.) How are the *spies* said to be *messengers*? The word *αγγελος* means a messenger who bears *tidings*. But the *spies* were not sent with any *message*, *news*, or *tidings*. They were *sent* to spy out the land. (2.) Was it the sin of the *spies* that they did not *watch* over their *principality*, but *deserted* their proper *station*? Was it not that they brought an evil report of the land? (3.) Is being reserved in chains to the judgment of the great day, and in *everlasting* chains, merely a "*temporal punishment*?" (4.) How can the sin of the *spies* refer to the *journey* of the *Israelites through the wilderness*, to *their rebellion* and *their subsequent punishment*?

Thus, after the utmost latitude is allowed to Mr. G. in his translation, he is obliged to make a most *arbitrary* application of the passage; and *misses the mark at last*. The passage from St. Peter's epistle remains untouched, for it would not admit of a similar application, and is therefore fully in our possession. It stands thus: "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment."*

It is probable that the *sin* of these angelic beings was *pride*. Hence St. Paul directs, that a Bishop should not be a "*novice* (or young convert) lest being lifted up with *pride*, he fall into the *condemnation* of the *Devil*."† How that *pride* was manifested, is not explained. But there may possibly be an *allusion* to their sin in that passage: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning ! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations ! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God : I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation,

* 2 Peter ii. 4.

† 1 Tim. iii. 16.

in the sides of the north : I will ascend above the heights of the clouds : I will be like the Most High."*

At the time of our Lord's appearance, these fallen spirits were permitted, in many instances, to take possession of the bodies of mankind. Mr. G. readily grants, "that it was a common opinion amongst all the heathen nations, that the spirits of departed men and heroes were permitted, after their death, to enter the bodies of human beings."† A similar notion, he admits, obtained among the *Jews*, who, he says, "gave the name of *demons* to those spirits which were permitted to enter the human frame to do evil."‡ This notion is, however, deemed by him perfectly erroneous, || and the demonology of the *Jews* is treated by him, as in no way connected with the scripture account of the *Devil*, or with the design of the mission of *Jesus Christ*.§ It will therefore be necessary to examine it.

The demoniacs, of whom we have so many accounts in the New Testament, were persons really possessed by demons. Such is the account which the *Evanglists* give of them. They do not speak of them as *supposed* to be possessed, but as being *really* so. "There met him two possessed with demons."¶ Such is their uniform language.—These demons were *wicked spirits*. "And they that were vexed with *unclean spirits* (came :) and they were healed."** "When the *unclean spirit* is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest ; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out.—Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other *spirits more wicked* than himself ; and they enter in, and dwell there : and the last state of that man is worse than the first."†† Hence, their uniform language is, "He was *casting out* a demon."‡‡ The circumstances of these cases admit of no other supposition than of real possessions. While the men said to be possessed, were cut off from all intercourse with persons who might give them any information respecting *Jesus Christ*, and therefore knew nothing

* Isa. xiv. 12—14.

† Vol. I. p. 73.

‡ Vol. I. p. 74.

|| Vol. I. p. 191.

§ Vol. I. p. 98.

¶ Matt. viii. 28.

** Luke vi. 18.

†† Luke xi. 24—26.

‡‡ Luke xi. 11.

of him, what were they who said, “What have we to do with thee, *Jesus*, thou Son of God? art thou come hither to torment us before the time?” Who in answer to the question, “What is thy name?” said, “Legion: because many demons were entered into him?” * Who *besought* him to “suffer them to go away into the herd of swine?” Who *went* into the herd of swine, and *drove* them, in spite of their keepers, into the sea? † What is that but a *spirit*, that *seeks rest* but can find none? that *resolves* to return to his first abode? and that *taketh with him* seven other *spirits, more wicked than himself?*

Mr. G. grants that such were the opinions of the *Jews*, and supposes that “it was no part of the office of Jesus to controvert them;” ‡ but rather that “he adopted the phraseology” of those “to whom his *instructions* were addressed.” || He makes, indeed, some apology for this, by supposing the doctrines of demonology to be merely *philosophical*: and “our Saviour (says he) was not sent to teach *philosophy*.” § But will this be a sufficient vindication of him who came “to bear witness of the TRUTH?” Did *Jesus Christ*, not only *overlook* the *superstitions* of the age in which he lived, but *confirm* them? Mr. Yates says, it is the opinion of the Unitarians that *Jesus Christ*, “by the force of his *doctrines* and *example*, saves men from *ignorance* and *superstition*.” (See p. 35.) Was it then for *this* purpose *Jesus Christ* *falsely* declared that the demons he cast out were “*unclean spirits*.” ¶ Nay, is not this to charge the Son of God with *imposture*? Did he not represent his *actually* “*casting out* demons by the finger of God,” as a proof that “the kingdom of God was come?” ** Was he not then, on Mr. G.’s hypothesis, a *false* and *uncommissioned* teacher? If so, it is time to give up our appeals to the doctrine of *Jesus Christ*, and to receive as the *only* true Apostles of God, the *Socinians*, who now teach that “whatsoever was written of old time was (*not*) written for our *learning*,” but in conformity to the superstitions of the times! Happily for us, however, Mr. G. has lucid intervals; and at one of those seasons,

* Luke viii. 30. † Matl. viii. 28—32. ‡ Vol. I. p. 92. || Vol. I. p. 73.

§ Vol. I. p. 93. ¶ Luke xi. 24. ** Luke xi. 20.

more favourable to truth, he says, in proof that he ought not to be afraid of attacking popular prejudices, “that *Jesus and his Apostles* pursued one *direct* course, in opposition to long-established opinions, and regardless and fearless of consequences, leaving them to God” * Such is Mr. G’s consistency !

On the supposition that Jesus Christ was a “teacher sent from God,” and that what Mr. G. calls “his *instructions*” were not, like those of the Jewish Scribes, the “doctrines of men,” but the truth of God, with what propriety could he say “we have nothing to do with all those passages in the New Testament, where persons are spoken of as being possessed ; they have no reference to our subject ?” †—except that those passages are an insuperable bar to the progress of *Socinianism*. To shew that they have the *most direct* “reference” to our subject, we will observe that,

1. Of these demons the *Jews* deemed *Beelzebub* the *chief*. Mr. G. has granted this proposition : ‡ and St. Luke relates, that “some of them said, He casteth out demons through *Beelzebub* the *chief* of the demons.” ||

2. This *Beelzebub*, the *chief* of the demons, our Lord called *Satan*. For when the *Jews* thus accused him of casting out demons by *Beelzebub*, he said unto them, “If *Satan* be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand ? because ye say, that I cast out demons by *Beelzebub*.” §

3. The name *Satan* is that which our Lord generally used in speaking of him; but he whom our Lord calls *Satan*, is by the Evangelist, speaking his own language, called the *Devil*. In the account which St. Matthew has given of our Lord’s temptation, he relates that Jesus said : “Get thee hence, *Satan*.” ¶ But the Evangelist says, “the *Devil* taketh him up into the holy city :—the *Devil* taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain :” and—“then the *Devil* leaveth him.” **

4. This *Satan*, the *Devil*, *Beelzebub*, is called the *chief* of demons ; and in perfect accord with this notion, our Lord attributed to him a *kingdom*. “If *Satan* be divided against

* Vol. I. p. 108. † Vol. I. p. 74. ‡ Vol. I. p. 74. || Luke xi. 15.

§ Luke xi. 12. ¶ Matt. iv. 10. ** Matt. iv. 5, 8, 11.

himself, how shall his *kingdom stand?*"* Hence, we read so often of "*the Devil* and his *angels*."

5. These *demons*, the *subjects of Beelzebub*, the Devil's *angels*, are also called *Satan*. Our Lord supposes, that for *Beelzebub* to cast out *demons*, would be for "*Satan to cast out Satan*."† Thus *one demon or many*, is *Satan*.—In like manner, as the operations of an army are attributed to their general, because it moves under his direction: so the operations of the demons, under the direction of their *chief*, are attributed to *him*. "Put on," says the Apostle Paul, "the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of *the Devil*. For we wrestle against *principalities*, against *powers*, against the *rulers* of the darkness of this world."‡ Thus the *Devil*, in the *singular number*, is equivalent to *principalities*, *powers*, and *rulers*, in the *plural*.

6. These "*principalities, powers, and rulers*" are said to be, "*not flesh and blood*," not *men*, but *spiritual wickedness in high (heavenly) places*."*||*

7. And lastly, This *chief* of demons, the *Devil* and *Satan*, is called the *Tempter*.—And when "*the Tempter came to him, &c. §—That Satan tempt you not*."¶

Thus, instead of finding that the passages in which *demons* are mentioned "have no reference to our subject," we find them a most useful key, to open the doctrine on which Mr. G. has so rashly and injudiciously made an attack.—We will now consider some of those passages which still further illustrate and confirm the truths which we have developed.

The first case which we shall consider, is the seduction of *Eve*. The *Mosaic* account of that transaction, Mr. G. has attempted to puzzle by a dilemma. He supposes that we must interpret it either *literally*, and so make *nonsense* of it, or *allegorically*, and make nearly *nothing* of it.—And is this really the case? Must every thing which is said or written, be interpreted as "*perfectly literal*" or entirely *allegorical*? Is there no medium? Let us try.

* Luke xi. 18.

† Matt. xii. 26.

‡ Eph. vi. 11, 12.

|| Eph. vi. 12.

§ Matt. iv. 3.

¶ 1 Cor. vii. 5.

There is no impropriety whatever in supposing that the whole transaction is related *just as it appeared*. “The serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made.” The serpent then was a real serpent, a beast of the field, and a creature which God had made. “And he said unto the woman,” &c. So it was. He actually spoke. And this circumstance leads us to enquire whether, in this transaction, the serpent were a principal, or merely the tool of another. The reasoning and speech were not his own, and we are warranted to say, that they were *of the Devil*. “Little children, let no man deceive you: He that committeth sin is *of the Devil*; for the Devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil.”* Here we learn that sin is *of the Devil from the beginning*, and that *he* that came to “bruise the serpent’s head,” came to destroy the works of the Devil. Nor is this interpretation in any measure forced, but perfectly consonant with the general tenor of Scripture. “The old Serpent” is said to be “the Devil, and Satan.”† Our Lord said to the Jews, “Ye are of your father, the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.”‡ Who then can doubt that he was the *father* of that lie by which our Parent was deceived; and by the effect of it, a murderer from the beginning?

We do not, however, say, as Mr. G. supposes, “that there grew a tree whose fruit was capable of imparting a knowledge of good and evil;” || but of which the prohibition taught man to know what was *good*, viz. to abstain from that fruit,—and what was *evil*, viz. to eat of it. We say “that God walked in the garden to seek for Adam,” not because we forget that God is a *Spirit*: but because we believe that if we had witnessed the transaction, we could not have described it in more appropriate terms. We do not say “that Adam called to inform the Deity of his hiding place;”

* 1 John iii. 7, 8. † Rev. xx. 2. ‡ John viii. 44. || Vol. I. p. 66.

but that Mr. G. should *read* the passage on which he *comments*. We say, that the serpent “was cursed above all cattle,” because we believe that Mr. G. cannot contradict that saying, any more than he can deny that it “was compelled to crawl upon the ground and eat the dust” with its food.

As Mr. G.’s prejudice has raised these, to him, insuperable difficulties in the *common* interpretation of this passage, his ingenuity, with a little assistance, has found out *another* which he imagines to be more *easy*. He has learned from Philo the Jew, that “it is an allegory expressive of what really happened, under feigned images, and the serpent, says he, is an emblem of vicious pleasure.”* But here we must pay a just tribute to Mr. G.’s *prudence*! He does not say that it is so; but makes use of this Jewish fable, to get rid of the difficulty; and then leaves poor Philo to answer for it. But until Mr. G. honestly disclaim, what he dare not venture to maintain, it will not be unfair to say, that he ought to be sure that he has not multiplied, instead of lessening, our difficulties.—1. This half-adopted comment, is a mere gratuitous assumption, without the smallest particle of proof. But then, to a *Socinian*, proof is not always necessary for the support of *his own* hypothesis. To get rid of the testimony of scripture is the task, and the means are not to be scrupulously examined.—2. If the *whole* be an *allegory*, and Mr. G. loudly insists upon *consistency*, then we have not only an *allegorical* serpent, but an *allegorical* tree, bearing *allegorical* fruit, and an *allegorical* garden; an *allegorical* woman, formed *allegorically* out of an *allegorical* man; in a word, an *allegorical* creation. But Mr. G. has brought us into a labyrinth, from which it will puzzle both him and the “learned Jew” to extricate us.—3. The serpent is indirectly said to be *one of the beasts of the field, which the Lord God had made*; whereas, *vicious pleasure*, however beastly, is neither a *beast* nor a *creature of God*.—4. “*Vicious pleasure*” had no existence, in the woman, until she had been guilty of sin by tasting of a *forbidden pleasure*. Could she know any thing of the *pleasure of sin* before she had *sinned*?—5. Moses describes the

* Vol. I. p. 81.

reasonings of the tempter as preceding the thought of the pleasure of eating the forbidden fruit. The woman first heard the tempter, and afterwards saw "that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise." The tempter was therefore distinct from the thought of any pleasure in the sin.—6. How is "*vicious pleasure*" cursed? Is there any curse attached to it now, more than before the fall? And how is "*vicious pleasure*" cursed above all cattle?—7. What enmity is there now put between the woman and *vicious pleasure*? Was there not greater enmity between them before than since the commission of sin?—8. How is vicious pleasure to eat the dust?

No absurdities are too great for those who refuse to take the plain letter of scripture for their guide; who "strain out a gnat, and swallow a camel!" When an Atheist speaks of the phenomena around him, because he cannot do so without allowing a great, universal, free, and active, first-cause, he *imagines* a being whom he calls *Nature*, to whom he attributes the designs and operations of a *real* being, whose existence he is disposed to deny. Thus, they who wish to drive the Devil out of the universe, cannot help observing how many of his works remain; and feel themselves under the necessity of finding him a substitute, who, during his absence, may manage his affairs with as much discretion, and do his work with as much ability, as he himself. To effect this, a well-imagined being is poetically created, which, lest it should seem to be nothing for want of a name, is dubbed "*the evil principle*," or "*vicious pleasure*." It must not be supposed that this is a *Devil*, any more than that *Nature* is a *God*. It has neither a body nor a soul. It is a mere accident, without any substance in which to inhere. It was not a *God*; for "*God is light*, and in him is no darkness at all." It was not in *man*, before the fall; "for in the *image of God* made he him." It did not exist in the *Serpent*, for that is supposed to be a nonentity, and in fact was a mere animal, and therefore incapable of moral principles either *good* or *evil*. It was an effect without a cause. It had a beginning without an author. And it had an existence when, as yet,

it was *nothing*. It was an *absurdity*, fit only to nestle in the brains of *would-be philosophers*, and to cast its spawn in *those works* which are intended to supplant the *Bible*.—It is the property of error to be *inconsistent*. When the degeneracy of human nature is to be denied, no *evil principle* is acknowledged. But when the *Devil* is to be destroyed, his *Ghost* haunts his murderers in the shape of “the *evil principle*,” and is left sufficiently alive and substantial to find a way into the heart of Eve, and to tempt even Jesus Christ. What *Devil* that was ever invented, could be worse than this “*evil principle?*”

The book of *Job*, which records the manifold temptations of that “upright man,” imputes them all to Satan, and was probably written to make known to God’s people the *Author of mischief*, and to guard them against his temptations. Mr. G. grants, that “this great doctrine (the being of *Satan*) is more explicitly taught in that, than in any other book,”* and therefore needed not to suppose that it was “borrowed from the *Persian* theology, or conjured up by philosophers, at a non-plus to account for the origin of evil.”† We, on the other hand, may be excused if we have imbibed our opinions from *that* book, for those opinions cannot now be said to be *unscriptural*. What then is to be done? Why, with the utmost *effrontery*, he calls it “an eastern *fable*, a poetical effusion, not improbably a *drama*.”‡ Thus, with a Socinian, those parts of scripture which do not give countenance to his creed, are *any thing*, or *nothing*: a *legendary tale*, or an *old ballad*. Instead of granting that “whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our *learning*;” he will (some would say, blasphemously) suppose that they were written when the Author was in a merry mood, for the entertainment of boys and girls on a holyday.

“The first chapter,” says Mr. G., “will furnish us with a *key* to the term (*Satan*) in every other part of the book;”|| but he might as well have called it a *fire* in which to burn the whole. The difficulties with which he meets in that chapter, are converted into some kind of proof that the

* Vol. I. p. 81.

† Vol. I. p. 76.

‡ Vol. I. p. 81.

|| Vol. I. p. 81

whole must be an *allegory*. Now we must observe two things.—1. That the allusions with which we meet in scripture, are allusions to *real* facts, and to *real* beings. The sacred writers do not “conjure up” *imaginary* beings “at a non-plus,” either for the exercise of their genius, or the amusement of their readers. Such a conduct would but ill become those who are commissioned to instruct mankind in things *spiritual*. If therefore we should grant that the first chapter of Job is an *allegory*, still we should maintain that all its allusions are founded in *facts*, and that the *poetical* mention of Satan, in such a book, would be proof of his *existence*. Mankind have invented *superstitions* enough, without receiving any addition to them from those scriptures which are intended for the *destruction of error*, and the *diffusion of divine truth*. So far is the book of Job from “darkening counsel by words *without knowledge*,” that, in that book the practice is reproved. See Job xxx. 8.—2. That there is no ground for the supposition that the book of Job is an *allegory*. It is an exposition of what actually took place, couched in such terms as will best convey the *truth* to *human* minds. In *what terms* would Mr. G. describe the transactions of the *invisible* world, if he reject such as are used in the chapter in question? Have those *Socinians*, who suppose their own souls to be nothing but *organized matter, refined* and *spiritualized* their *ideas*, so as to be able to speak of *spiritual* things in any other language than “*after the manner of men?*”

To answer Mr. G.’s objections to the literal interpretation of this book, is rather to instruct *ignorance*, than to combat *argument*. “*Satan*,” says he, “comes *unawed, unabashed*, into the presence of the Almighty! The great *Jehovah* condescends to hold a conversation with him, upon terms of the *utmost familiarity*. With the most perfect *confidence* he gives an account to God what he has been doing. The Almighty points out a being to him as having *escaped his notice!*”*—Now is this *argument*? Is it any thing more than *flourish*? The words printed in *Italics* are the *emphatical* words, and in them the strength of the *supposed*

* Vol. I. p. 32.

argument consists. But they are the *comment*, not the *text*. One of them is entirely *false*, and the rest are mere *conjecture*.—Again, “He *begs of God* to afflict this man?”—What wonder?—“God gives him permission to afflict him.”—And does not God *permit* all our afflictions? Does not Mr. G. know that *blessed* is the man that endureth temptation; for when he is tried he shall receive the crown of life?—“Was it necessary that he should first go and *petition* the Almighty?”—He could not afflict Job without permission; for after all the *Devil* is not *Almighty*.—“In every sense of the word was not the Devil *his* (God’s) *agent*?”—No. He acted not *for* God, at the divine *command*, but under *permission*.—“Were not the Sabeans, the Chaldeans, the lightning, the hurricane, sufficient agents of the Deity?”—Now Mr. G. has answered his own question. Why might not Satan be permitted to do apparent mischief, as well as the Sabeans and the Chaldeans?—“But were not the latter sufficient?”—They did not fight against Job, till Satan had obtained permission, and then they acted their part under his influence and management.—“But Job imputes the whole to God.”—He did so, and justly; for all Job’s trials had by him been wisely permitted and overruled. If this argument prove the nonentity of Satan, it will equally prove the nonentity of the Sabeans and Chaldeans.

But how does Mr. G.’s interpretation consist with the text? “The sons of God were the *holy* men who came to worship in the *temple* of the Lord. Their wicked adversaries, their *Satan*, assembled with them, opposed them to the utmost of their power, and were permitted by God to be successful in their schemes of hostility.”—This is the way to make every thing *simple* and *clear*. Now what becomes of the *conversation* between God and Satan? It is unphilosophical! What raised the *hurricane*? What caused the *lightning* to descend? Who afflicted Job’s *body* with *boils*? Mr. G. has *left* you to find out all that as you may. He does not wish to be responsible for the difficulties of which he is the Author.

Our “great High-Priest was tempted in all things, like the children of men.” His temptations are, by the Evan-

gelist, imputed to a *diabolical* agency. The whole account of this transaction is to be found in Matt. iv. But Mr. G. again objects to the *literal* interpretation. Without repeating, that the whole account is couched in terms the most proper for conveying the truth of the facts to mankind, we will hear and answer his objections.

“Jesus was led by the spirit, into the wilderness, on purpose to be tempted by the Devil.”* Just so. He came to bruise the serpent’s head; and there must be a *conflict*, before there could be a *conquest*. “I will put enmity (said God himself) between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. †—He had fasted *forty* days, when he *began* to be hungry.”‡ That he was hungry *after* a fast of forty days, is no great wonder. And that he should fast forty days without being hungry till then, is as possible as that he should *live* forty days without food; or that Moses and Elijah should hold a fast of the same duration. “All things are possible with God.—Man shall not live by *bread alone*, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God:” by any means which God is pleased to ordain.—“He knew the Devil as soon as he appeared to him.”|| What then?—“The Devil walked with him, through the city of *Jerusalem*, to a pinnacle of the temple.”—Suppose the Devil to have assumed a human appearance, and where is the difficulty?—“He next accompanied him to a high mountain where he could see *all the kingdoms of the world*; a thing naturally impossible!”§—Perhaps it was a *visionary* representation. Or, the expression may possibly have a *limited* meaning, as in Luke ii. 1. “And then the Devil, knowing he was speaking to the Son of God, who was aware who *he* was, had the *presumption* to ask, that he would fall down and worship *him*, instead of God the Father.”¶—Mr. G. is very much concerned that the *Devil* should speak and act with great propriety and decorum, and in a manner worthy of the *omniscience* which *he* imputes to him. *Satan* has not, however, on this occasion manifested so much presumption as Mr. G.’s jealousy has led him to

* Vol. I. p. 87.

|| Vol. I. p. 87.

† Gen. iii. 15.

§ Vol. I. p. 87.

‡ Vol. I. p. 87.

¶ Vol. I. p. 88.

suspect. He did not ask the Son of God to worship him *instead of* God the Father ; but since the contest between them was for the dominion of the world, he, with sufficient subtlety and impudence, proposed to cede to him the whole on condition that he would do him religious homage for it.

“ Upon suspicion that all these *inconsistencies* [an unlucky word !] still gain credit, I add one more, that if Jesus Christ were a *deity*, this was *no temptation at all*, for he knew him from the first, it required no effort to resist him, and nothing was to be *gained*, but every thing *lost* by obeying him.” *

—All the “*inconsistency*,” as Mr. G. calls it, arises from a false supposition, that, if *Jesus Christ* was *God*, he was not *man* ; that if he was *almighty*, he had no human *infirmitiy*. Suppose him *human*, as well as *divine*, and the difficulty vanishes. On Mr. G.’s hypothesis, *Jesus Christ* had then “ received miraculous powers ;” † if so, what effort was necessary to him in withstanding temptation ? The power which afterwards cast out demons, was sufficient to withstand this temptation. The answer in one case serves equally in the other. In either case, “ nothing was to be *gained*, but every thing (was to be) *lost*, by obeying” the tempter.

Let us now attend to Mr. G.’s comment on the history of our Lord’s temptation.—“ Contrast with this interpretation the following, which the very expression of, being led *by the Spirit*,” seems at once to denote. As soon as *Jesus* had received, from God, all the miraculous powers conferred upon him at his baptism, his mind was occupied with the thought, how he might be able to use these powers. *Worldly thoughts* first arose ; *worldly objects* presented themselves to his view. *This* adversary to divine things, *this* Satan, suggested to him the use of his miraculous powers. How he might gratify his palate, by *speaking* only to the stones ; how he might command universal admiration and obedience, by publicly *throwing* himself from the temple ; how he might gain universal dominion by the corrupt use of his power.” ‡

We may observe that in his own comments, Mr. G. meets with *no* difficulty. He never applies his key to try

* Vol. I. p. 88.

† Vol. I. p. 88.

‡ Vol. I. p. 89.

whether it be fitted to all the wards of the lock. We will point out its *deficiencies*, its *contradiction* to the text, and its glaring *improprieties*.

1. There are in his hypothesis many great *deficiencies*. It affords no explanation, either proper or figurative, of most of the circumstances of the history. It includes no account of the “*wilderness*” into which *Jesus* was led; of the *purpose* for which he was led thither; of the *leader* who brought him thither; of the *time* which he spent there; of the *fast* which he held; of the “*coming*” of the tempter; of Christ’s *journey* from the wilderness to the holy city; of his being *set* on a pinnacle of the temple; of his *journey* from thence to an exceeding high mountain; of the *view* which he had of the kingdoms of the world; of the *worship* which some person requested; or of the *promise* which that person made to him.

2. The comment *contradicts* the text. St. Matthew says, that *Jesus* was led by the *Spirit* into the wilderness. Mr. G. grants that he had *received* the Spirit; and cites the words “*led by the Spirit*;” but supposes him to be led only by his *own thoughts*: thoughts which *could not* be suggested by the *Holy Spirit*. The text names *four* times the *Devil* as the *tempter*. Now *this* word was perfectly *unmanageable*. Mr. G. knows that it means a *slanderer*, and he has not been able to find a place where the word is used, except where it is applied to some *real being*. As this word, therefore, would not bend to his purpose, he takes hold rather of the word *Satan*, which our Lord has *once* used, as more *flexible*. He could not make *worldly thoughts* into a *slanderer*, but he could suppose them an *adversary*.

3. Mr. G.’s “interpretation” has in it some glaring *improprieties*. According to him, the “*first thoughts*” which arose in the mind of *Jesus* after he had received the *Holy Spirit*, and when he was under the special guidance of that Spirit, were “*worldly thoughts*.”* Here is the *abstract* “*evil principle!*” The *accident* without a *substance*! “The *cloven foot* walking about *without the Devil!*” We do not misunderstand Mr. G. “The word *devil*, (he says,) seems

* Vol. I. p. 22.

in general acceptation to signify *nothing more* than that *propensity to ill*, observable in the human mind ; * and, like many *occult* qualities, *is found of great use* in the solution of various *difficulties*.† Thus all Mr. G.'s *difficulties* are solved by applying this "*occult quality*," this "*propensity to ill*," to him "*who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners*." The *Socinians* have now attached the "*cloven foot*" to the *Saviour of mankind*! No wonder that *Jesus*, no *real Devil* being with him, putting this *foot* ~~FORE~~^{MOST}, found his way to the *pinnacle of the temple*, *that he might cast himself down*; or to the mountain from which he might see the glorious kingdoms of the world, and worship—*nothing*.—Who are they now, who *crucify* the Son of God afresh, and put him *to an open shame*? Who are they who count the blood of the covenant an *unholy* thing?

There is a passage in St. Jude to which Mr. G. has replied in a Note; but which might have deserved some notice in the body of his work. "It may be well, says he, to mention a tradition which will serve to elucidate Jude 9, respecting *Michael* the archangel and the *Devil*. Among the Talmudists there is something like the relics of such a matter, namely, of *Michael* and the *angel of death* disputing, or discoursing about fetching away the soul of *Moses*. This Messenger of death, therefore, is called the Devil or adversary."‡—So the words "*disputing*," and "*discoursing*,"—the "*body of Moses*" and the "*soul of Moses*,"—"devil" and "adversary," are here made convertible terms. So much for Socinian *precision*! This, to imitate it, is "*to elucidate*," or "*to put darkness for light*!"—The passage is, however, a very *ingenious* contrivance! To get rid of the *Devil*, another being, created by the fertile imagination of the *Jews*, is permitted by the *Socinians* to occupy his place. And this "*elucidation*" is supposed to be a satisfactory

* Query. Would Mr. G. and his *consistent* brethren of the Socinian *unbelief*, find "*that propensity to ill*, (so) *OBSERVABLE* in the *human mind*," if they were discussing the question of the depravity of human nature? Here, they find it "*observable*" in *Jesus Christ* himself. Is this more like a "*free enquiry*" after *truth*, or a contest for victory, in which even *truth* itself, with its inseparable companion, *consistency*, is to be immolated?

† Vol. I. p. 76. ‡ Vol. I. p. 94.

answer to all who urge the testimony of St. Jude, as evidence of the *existence of the Devil*. Such are the *arguments* of these great Masters of reason ! Here is a being, whose *real* existence, without a shadow of proof from the scriptures, is taken for granted : “*the angel of death!*” And yet, after all, this “*angel of death*” may be “*he that has the power of death*, that is *the Devil*.” A *good* angel would not “dispute with *Michael* and contend about the body of Moses.” To a *good* angel, *Michael* would not say, “*The Lord rebuke thee*.” And lastly a *good* angel would not be the “*adversary*” (as Mr. G. call this) either of *Moses* or of *Michael*. In fact, these words of Jude afford a direct and positive proof of the existence of a *fallen* angel, who is called by him “*the Devil*.”

When Jesus had sent out the “seventy, they returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the demons are subject to us through thy name. And he said unto them, I beheld *Satan*, as lightning, fall from heaven.” *—*Satan*, we have learnt, is the *prince of demons*, of whom our Lord, by a strong figure, thus predicts the final and entire overthrow. Mr. G. after a little flourish about the absurdity of a *literal* interpretation, supposes *Satan* here to mean “the *adversaries of the Christian cause*.” To this we must add, that they were, as the words of our Lord demonstrate, *especially* the *spiritual* adversaries which were intended, “*Notwithstanding*,” he subjoins, “*in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you*.” †

As we have found, in the facts which have been examined, ample reason to acknowledge the *existence* of the *Devil*; we shall find, in the general language of the New Testament, sufficient reason to suppose him the *Tempter* of mankind.—We are exhorted to “stand against the *wiles* of the *Devil*.” ‡—We are represented to be in danger “lest *Satan* should get an advantage against us;” because of his “*devices*.” ||—The *prince of the power of the air*, is a “*spirit which worketh in the children of disobedience*.” § Thus “*Cain who slew his brother*, was of that *wicked one*.” ¶—Is any man *ignorant* of the gospel which has been preached to

* Luke x. 17, 18.

† Luke v. 20.

‡ Eph. vi. 11.

|| 2 Cor. ii. 11.

§ Eph. i. 2.

¶ 1 John iii. 12.

him?—"the *God of this world* hath blinded his mind."* Does any man live in the commission of sin?—"he is *of the Devil*."† "Ye are of your father *the Devil*, (said our Lord to his wicked countrymen,) and the *lusts* of your *father* ye will do."‡

To conclude this part of the argument; the scriptures speak of the *judgment*, the *condemnation* and the *punishment* of *the Devil*.

1. Of the *judgment* of the Devil. "Know ye not," says St. Paul, "that we shall judge *angels*?" By angels, we here understand *fallen* angels; for the *holy* angels, will be ministers in the judgment of men. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the *holy angels* with him."||— "The Son of Man shall send forth his *angels*, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire."§—Now the Apostle's argument would lose all its weight, unless he meant to distinguish between fallen *men* and fallen *angels*.

2. Of the *condemnation* and *punishment* of the Devil. When our Lord alludes to the final punishment of wicked men, he says, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, *prepared for the Devil and his angels*."¶ Thus has he marked the antecedent sin of the *Devil* and his *angels*, and the punishment prepared for *them*, as distinguished from the wicked *men* who are doomed to share it *with them*.

Thus we find that there is a *wicked Devil*, the *tempter* of mankind, who is distinguished from *men* on the one hand, and from mere *abstract principles* on the other.—We must now proceed to answer Mr. G.'s incidental objections.

I. When it is so plain a fact that there is an *infernal Devil*, and *spiritual Satan*, it can answer no purpose for Mr. G. to quote a hundred texts of scripture to prove that *men*, or *women* are sometimes called devils, (i. e. calumniators) or satans (i. e. adversaries.) The existence of ten thousand human devils, and earthly satans, brings no evidence that there is no *chief of demons*, no *spiritual Devil*, or *hellish Satan*.

* 2 Cor. iv. 4.

|| Matt. xxv. 31.

† 1 John iii. 8.

§ Matt. xiii. 41, 42.

‡ John viii. 44.

¶ Matt. xxv. 41.

II. It will not answer Mr. G.'s purpose to shew that "nearly every *office*, which is usually ascribed to the *Devil*, is in some part of the scriptures ascribed either to *God* or to *angels*." * This assertion, as far as it relates to *angels*, he has not attempted to prove, and therefore that part of it goes for nothing. If he mean to impute the same things to *God*, in the *same sense* as to the *Devil*, then—1. He must exculpate Judas who betrayed, and the *chief priests* who crucified, our Lord; for "being delivered by the *determinate counsel* and *foreknowledge* of *God*, they by wicked hands crucified and slew him." †—2. He makes God the author of sin. Nothing can be more obvious than this; for if what is *wickedness* in *Satan*, be ascribed in the *same sense* to *God*, it is *wickedness* still. Nor is this the only argument by which Mr. G. in support of his system, certainly with no other design, makes God the *Author* of all *sin*, and lays on him the *blame* of all the *mischief* in the universe. "If the Almighty," says he, "can retain this infernal being in fetters whenever he pleases, and suffer him to roam at large only when he wills,—this *permission* of the Almighty is the same as if it were *his own act and deed*. For to *permit* what you *can prevent* is the same as to *perform*." Now cannot God equally *prevent* all the wickedness of *mankind*? But does he *prevent* it? No: In the sense of Mr. G. he *permits* it: that is, though he forbids it, he does not absolutely *prevent* it. Is then all the sin of mankind to be charged on the Almighty, as *his own act and deed*?—3. He rather *proves*, than *disproves*, the existence of the *Devil*; for if the works which are attributed to *God*, are in the *same sense* attributed to the *Devil*, the latter must have a *real* existence, as well as the former.—If, on the other hand, he impute similar works to the *best* and to the *worst* of beings, but not to each in the *same sense*, his argument proves only that *two* beings, with different *designs*, and therefore both *intelligent*, are employed among mankind.

But to prevent the mischief which his observation may in another way effect, it will be necessary to shew:—1. That *Satan tempts men, by soliciting them to sin*; but that *God*,

* Vol. I. p. 108.

† Acts ii. 23.

in this sense, “tempteth no man.” God tempts them, as he tempted *Abraham*, by putting their faith to a severe trial; that “the trial of their faith, might be found unto praise and honour and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ.”—2. Bodily disorders may have been inflicted on men by the *Devil*, as in the case of *Job*, with intent that those men may “curse God and die.” But *God* inflicts them often as a salutary chastisement; that, like *Job*, those men may bless God and live.—3. The wicked dispositions and conduct of men are imputed to the *Devil*, because he delights in wickedness; but *God* is said to harden their hearts, that is, to give them up to judicial hardness, because their wickedness is *incorrigible*.—4. *God* is said to send on some “a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned;” and thus, not “to promote the deceit of *Satan*,” but, to give up to him, as incurable, those “who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.”

For what purpose, any man, calling himself a *Christian* Minister, could make such a comparison between *God* and the *Devil* without any explanation, is left to the Searcher of hearts to determine. It could not possibly serve his hypothesis; while it tends to undermine the credit of divine revelation. Thus do some men “sport themselves with their own deceivings.”

III. Mankind have undoubtedly *other* sources of temptation. “Our animal passions and bodily appetites expose us to innumerable temptations.” * But Mr. G.’s appeal to the *mercy*, or to the *justice*, of *God*, is by no means a proof that these are the *only* means of our probation. In the present case such an appeal is, in fact, only an appeal from sacred scripture to the *passions* of mankind. If Mr. G. grant that, in the dispensations of divine providence, we meet with many trials, and that, unless it be our own fault, those trials are salutary, he will find it difficult to prove that temptations from *Satan* may not be, in general, equally beneficial. The effects which the *scriptures* attribute to *diabolical* agency, he attributes to *other* causes. What then has he gained? If the *effects*, viz. the number and weight of our trials, be

* Vol. I. p. 71.

the same ; what difference will it make in our views of either the justice or the mercy of God, that the causes are many or few, that they are great or diminutive ?—Where is the *injustice* of calling a moral agent to a combat, in which he may be “*more than conqueror?*” And where is the *unmercifulness* of calling him to endure temptations, in the conquest of which he is supremely “*blessed,*” and after which he shall “*receive the crown of life?*”

IV. There is as much danger from the *breach* as from the *mouth* of Mr. G.’s cannon. Its *recoil* is as destructive as its *shot*. He has just been complaining of the injustice and cruelty of the divine dispensations, in exposing us to the temptations of the *Devil*; and yet if you do not grant *omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence*, to the *Devil, Satan* falls beneath his contempt. Then, “all his super-human powers are *futile*. A malicious *human* agent would answer every purpose.”* This argument may serve for an answer to the preceding. They destroy each other. In the mean time, Mr. G. and his readers are requested once more to consider whether, with *finite* creatures, every thing be matter of *indifference*, which is not absolutely *infinite*.

Should the impossibility of a *finite* being tempting many persons, in different places, at one time, leave an apparent difficulty on this subject, it must be noticed,—1. That the *Devil* has many *demons* under his direction.—2. That we do not precisely know what relation a spirit has to place.—3. That though the power of Satan is not *infinite*, it may be very *great*.—4. That we are not sure that evil spirits may not produce effects which often remain when those spirits are no longer immediately present. We know that a moral principle, once imbibed, often produces effects for a long period after the departure of the person from whom it has been imbibed.

V. Mr. G. thinks, however, that the doctrine of the existence of the *Devil*, cannot be a “*fundamental* article in the Christian religion.”†—What is meant by “*a fundamental article*,” has not yet been agreed. It is enough that this doctrine enters so far into the *essence of Christianity*, that all

* Vol. I. p. 21.

+ Vol. I. p. 96.

who deny the *existence* of the *Devil*, must (as they actually do,) deny all the *peculiar* and *prominent* doctrines of the New Testament. No man is properly acquainted with the condition of *human* nature, until he know that “the whole world lieth in ($\tau\omega\ \pi\omega\nu\rho\omega$) the *wicked one*.”* Only the existence, operations, and success of the Devil, can properly account for the *incarnation* and *death* of the Son of God, who came to *bruise* the *serpent's head*. “For this *purpose* the Son of God was manifested, that he might *destroy* the *works* of the *Devil*.”† “When the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that, through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, *the Devil*.”‡ We cannot pray as we ought, unless we make it *one* of our petitions, “Deliver us from ($\tau\omega\ \pi\omega\nu\rho\omega$) the *wicked*, or *evil one*.”|| The preachers of the gospel do not execute their commission, unless they turn men “*from the power of Satan, to God*.”§ The encouraging promise of the gospel is that “the God of peace shall *bruise Satan under our feet*, shortly.”¶ And it is the glory of a Christian to “have overcome ($\tau\o\pi\ \pi\omega\nu\rho\omega\pi\omega$) the *wicked one*.”**

VI. “What! does *virtue* depend upon the belief of a *Devil*? ”††—Not *Socinian* virtue; but *Christian* virtue depends much upon it.. *Christian* virtue includes the duties—of “*believing*” the truths and warnings of God ;—of “*watchfulness* and *prayer*, that we enter not into temptation ;”—of “*resisting* the *Devil*, that he may flee from us ;”—and of “*overcoming* the *wicked one*.”—Because of the *wiles* of the *Devil*,—because we are opposed, not merely by “flesh and blood,” but also by “principalities and powers, and by the rulers of the darkness of this world, by *spiritual* wickedness in high places.”—Christian virtue consists much in being “*strong in the Lord and in the power of his might*,”—in “*withstanding* in the evil day,”—in having our loins girt about with *truth*,—in having on the breast-plate of *righteousness*,—in having our feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of *peace*,—above all, in taking the shield of *faith*, wherewith we shall be able to quench all

* 1 John v. 19. † 1 John iii. 8. ‡ Heb. ii. 14. || Matt. vi. 13.

§ Acts xxvi. 18. ¶ Rom. xvi. 20. ** 1 John ii. 11. †† Vol. I. p. 101.

the fiery darts ($\tau\pi\pi\omega\nu\eta\rho\mu$) of the wicked one,—in taking the helmet of *salvation*, and the sword of the Spirit which is the *word* of God ;—and in *praying* always, with all *prayer* and supplication in the *Spirit*, and *watching* thereunto with all perseverance.” *

VII. Nor does this doctrine, which teaches many Christian duties unknown to those who deny it, take off from man his *responsibility*. We, as well as Mr. G. “ warn thee, *Christian*, not to ascribe thy *crimes* to the *influence* of an *infinitely malignant, irresistible, omnipotent* being, because we tell thee, no such being exists in the universe.” † And we say more than Mr. G. will care to say : viz. that mankind may overcome “ that old *serpent*, called the *Devil*, and *Satan*, which deceiveth the whole world :” but only “ by the *blood of the LAMB*.” “ Blessed be the Lord God of *Israel*; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David : as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began : that we should be saved from our *enemies*, and from the hand of all that *hate* us ; to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant, the oath which he sware to our father *Abraham*, that he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hands of our *enemies*, might serve him *without fear*, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.”

* Eph. vi. 10—18.

+ Vol. I. p. 102.

CHAPTER IV

Of the Unity of God.

THE first chapter of this work will serve to shew how little dependance is to be placed on the deductions of human reason, unaided by divine revelation. Mr. G.'s arguments on the divine *Unity*, amply confirm those which have been there adduced. Through every paragraph of his Lecture on that subject, while he professes to deduce his doctrine from the light of nature, he either takes for granted the thing to be proved, or borrows his doctrine from the scriptures: and sometimes he does both at once. An examination of his ridiculous reasonings will, however, answer no purpose; since we are ready to grant what he contends for—that there is but *one* God. But we place this great truth on the ground of *revelation* only. The following passages may suffice to demonstrate it.

“Thou shalt have no *other* Gods before me. *—The Lord, he is God, there is *none else* besides him.—The Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath, there is *none else*. †—Is there a God *besides* me? yea there is *no* God, I know not *any*. They that make a graven image are all of them vanity.—Before me there was *no* God formed, neither shall there be after me. I, even I, am the Lord; and *beside* me there is *no* Saviour. I have saved, and I have shewed, when there was no strange God among you. ‡—The Lord thy God is *one LORD*.” ||

Such are the declarations of scripture that there is but *one* God. The candid reader will observe, however, that these testimonies uniformly go to evince the *oneness* of God in contradistinction from the *plurality* of the Gods of the

* Exod. xx. 3. † Deut. iv. 35, 39. ‡ Isa. xliv. 8, 10—12. || Deut. vi. 4.

heathen. But the *metaphysical unity* of God, a *unity* which excludes the possibility of any kind of *distinction* in the divine nature, is not, in any of them, or in any other part of the sacred books, asserted.

As we do not look into the book of nature for the proof of the Divine *Unity*; we do not expect to learn from thence the doctrine of the *Trinity*. We confess to Mr. G. that we have no “plea from *reason* for the supposition that one must direct, a second execute, and a third influence.” * All that we know of God, we know *only* from his own revelation: and from that very source from whence we learn that God is *one*, we learn also that God is *three*: *one* in *one* sense, *three* in *another*, not incompatible with the first. While therefore we agree with Mr. G. in that grand proposition, that there is *one* God, we differ from his *metaphysical* doctrine of divine *unity*. Thinking that he perfectly comprehends that unity, and that, without the aid of revelation, from which, in point of fact, he has learned it, he can argue conclusively upon it, he accordingly sets himself to the metaphysical task. We are aware that we do not perfectly apprehend the metaphysical ideas of spirit and its unity: and as we cannot be sure that we reason conclusively on a proposition which we do not distinctly and perfectly apprehend, like children under the instruction of a teacher, we submit ourselves to the direction of our infallible guide, and learn the doctrine of the *Trinity*, from the same source from whence we have learned the Divine *Unity*. It is from thence we gather that the *one* God is—the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Spirit*.

It is enough, in this place, to state that our Lord, in giving a commission to his disciples, commanded them, “Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the *name* of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*.” †

The baptism of Christian believers is an ordinance obviously designed to initiate them into the church of Christ, and intended, like circumcision, as a dedication of their persons to *God*. It implies on the part of the person bap-

* Lect. Vol. I. p. 11.

† Matt. xxviii. 19.

tized, that he take the Christian God for his *God*, and that he devote himself to that God as his servant : and thus that he enter into covenant with him.

When the Apostles of Christ baptized the Jews, who, dedicated to *Jehovah* by Jewish baptism and circumcision, had already been initiated into the Church of God, and had received from the Old Testament "the promise of the Father," viz. the promise of the gift of his Holy Spirit, they baptized them in the name of *Jesus*. In vain therefore does Mr. G. cite the cases of Cornelius, and of the believers at Ephesus, to prove that the Apostles did *not* baptize in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, but in the name of *Jesus*; for Cornelius was probably a *Jewish proselyte*, (see Acts x. 22.) and the Ephesians had already been baptized "unto *John's* baptism." (See Acts xix. 3.) The commission which our Lord gave to his Apostles, was "to all *nations*," i. e. to the *Gentiles*, to whom the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Spirit*, had been equally unknown. These were to be baptized according to the commission which *Jesus Christ* had given: and the Apostles undoubtedly observed the charge which had been committed to them.

This form of baptism was connected with the first instructions which the Gentile converts were to receive; and therefore implies the doctrine which they were to learn. That they whom the Apostles had called from the worship of *idols*, to the worship of the *one God* who made heaven and earth, should, by a *religious act*, a reception of the *seal of the covenant of grace*, be dedicated to any being *less* than God, would, the *Socinians* being judges, have been only a change from one form of idolatry to another. But this was not the case. They were baptized, not in the *names*, but in the *one name* of the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*; from which we infer, that the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*, are the *one God* to whom we are to be devoted, and on whom all our Christian hopes are to be fixed.

CHAPTER V.

Of the Pre-existence, and Divinity of Jesus Christ.

THAT Jesus Christ was truly and properly a *man*, and that the doctrine of his *proper humanity* may be traced through all the New Testament, is undeniable. The *Socinians* invariably take advantage of this truth, and argue from it that he is a *mere man*. This, in a controversy with *Trinitarians*, is flatly begging the question, which is not, Is Jesus Christ a *man*? but, Is he a *man only*? That he is a *man*, we grant; but we contend that he is also *more than man*—that he is the *one eternal God*.

To separate the question of his *proper Divinity* from the doctrine of his *humanity*, let it first be understood, that, *according to the uniform testimony of scripture, he had an existence previous to his incarnation..* Such a *pre-existent* state, Mr. G. positively denies, and daringly asserts, that “we no where meet with any express declaration of it.”* With what degree of truth this assertion is made, the following citations will shew.

1. “He was made flesh. †—As the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise *took* part part of the same.—For verily he *took* not on (him the nature) of angels; but he *took* on (him) the seed of Abraham.”‡ These expressions involve the idea, that there was a *pre-existent* something, which was *made flesh*, and which *took* part of human nature.

2. *Jesus Christ* says—that “he *came down* from heaven,” that “he *came from above*;” || that he was *come from God*, and went to *God*;” § that he “*came forth* from the Father,

* Lect. Vol. I. p. 455. † John i. 11. ‡ Heb. ii. 16.

|| John iii. 13, 31. § John xiii. 3.

and came into the world; and would leave the world, and go to the Father.”* He is therefore said to be, *not* “of the earth, earthly,” but “*the Lord from heaven*.”† Mr. G. with all his efforts, has not been able to invalidate this evidence.‡ John the Baptist was a man “sent from God” to men, (as he observes) but he was not sent from *heaven* to *earth*. What Jesus Christ asserts of himself, he denies of all others: “*No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven*, even the Son of man, which is in heaven.” And *John* conceded to Jesus his *exclusive* claim: “*He that cometh from above* (said he) *is above all*: he that is *of the earth* is *earthly*, and *speaketh of the earth*.”|| The *baptism of John* is said to be *from heaven*, because he baptized by divine authority; but it is no where said that *John came down from heaven*. Again: the *coming of Jesus Christ* from heaven, is compared with his *return* thither. To this Mr. G. objects, “If our Saviour by descending from heaven literally meant a *personal* descent, by *ascending* into heaven he meant a *personal* ascent, and by being *in heaven* he meant a *personal presence there*, at the same time that he was *talking with Nicodemus upon earth*.§ This argument, by which Mr. G. if he mean to prove any thing, endeavours to prove that our Lord *contradicted himself*, is the very argument by which one would prove the doctrine in question. The *pre-existent* and *divine* nature of Jesus Christ solves the difficulty which he has imagined, and *unties* the knot which he finds it more convenient to *cut*.

3. When Jesus Christ came into the world, he came “*voluntarily*.” “*When he cometh into the world*, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but *a body hast thou prepared me*. *Lo, I come to do thy will, O God*.”¶ This proves that he *existed before* he came into the world, and *before* he *took on him the body prepared for him*, and that he took on him that body with his own *previous* consent.

4. Jesus Christ prayed, “And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with *the glory which I had with thee before the world was*.”** Here Mr. G. has two strings

* John xvi. 28. † 1 Cor. xv. 47. ‡ Vol. 1, p. 342. || John iii. 13, 31.

§ Vol. 1, p. 343. ¶ Heb. x. 5—7. ** John xvii. 5.

to his bow. (1.) He cites, by way of *contrast*, the following passages: “The lamb slain *from the foundation of the world*.—Who hath saved us—according to his own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ Jesus, *before the world began*.—He hath chosen us in him *before the foundation of the world*.”* Now every one of these passages proves, indirectly, the pre-existence of *Jesus Christ*. If *Jesus Christ* was, in the purpose of God, “*slain from the foundation of the world*,” and yet came *voluntarily* into the world, to “do the will of God” by “offering his body once for all,”† and therefore was not slain without his own consent,—he *consented, from the foundation of the world*, to be slain. If, *before the world began*, when we had *no personal* existence, we were chosen *in Christ Jesus*, and had grace given us *in him*,—he *then* existed *in whom*, as our representative and head, we were chosen, and *in whom* grace was given to us. —But he will try again: (2.) “Whatever be the glory of which Jesus speaks as applicable to himself, in the very same chapter he ascribes to his disciples.”‡ Thus *Jesus Christ* is robbed of the *peculiarity of his future*, as well as of his *past*, glory. But, first: It is not true that the Apostles have now a glory *equal* to that of him who has “*a name that is above every name*.” Secondly: If they have it now, had they, like him, this glory *with the Father* “*before the world was?*” How then did *Jesus Christ* give it to them *before the world was*, unless he *then* possessed it? (See John xvii. 24.)

5. *Jesus Christ* said, “*Before Abraham was, I am.*”|| The force of this passage Mr. G. has completely *evaded* by attempting to shew, that, on similar occasions, our translators have fixed the pronoun *he*, and to persuade us that there is the same reason for it here. But, in the present case, the *question* which *Jesus* answered, was precisely the question of his *pre-existence*. The *Jews* said unto him, “Thou art *not yet fifty years old*, and *hast thou seen Abraham?*” *Jesus* said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, *Before Abraham was, I am.*” To render it, I am *he*, would only incumber the answer, while the difficulty is the same, and

* Vol. 1. p. 345. † Heb. x. 10. ‡ Vol. 1. p. 346. || John viii. 58.

can only be solved by the supposition of his pre-existence. How could *Jesus* have seen *Abraham*, if he were not *cotemporary* with *Abraham*? Why does he speak in the *present* tense of himself, and in the *past* of *Abraham*? And, once more: if, when *Jesus* said, *I am*, he spoke of his *pre-determined* existence, how could a mere *pre-determination* of his existence render him capable of *seeing Abraham*?

6. We cannot do justice to this subject, without subjoining the testimony of the Evangelist John. “*In the beginning* was the *Word*, and the *Word* was with *God*, and the *Word* was *God*. The same was *in the beginning* with *God*.”* Mr. G. has conceded, that if we “understand by the term *beginning*,”—“the beginning of the *creation*,” this “accords with his interpretation of the *Logos* (the *Word*).”† Thus all is granted for which we contend: with this *proviso*, however, that we do not say, *In the beginning the Word began*, but *In the beginning was the Word*. To prevent all mischief to the Proteus, *Socinianism*, Mr. G. has taken care to give a *second* interpretation of the term,—*beginning*. He holds that he “may be *allowed* to understand by it, the beginning of the *new creation*.” But St. John does not *allow* it. He says, that “he was in the beginning *with God*:—that he was the light, which *lighteth every man that cometh into the world*;—that he was *made flesh*,” and therefore existed, *before* he was made flesh: and that “he was *before him*,” (John), ‡ though born *after him*. Now all this is perfectly inconsistent with the application of this expression to the *new creation*.

The distinct question now to be answered is, *Who, and what is he, who, independent of all humanity, existed before his incarnation?*

The scriptures expressly state, that, in his pre-existent nature, he was “the *Word of God*, the *brightness of the glory of God*, and the *express image* of his person.” Under these high names and titles, which it is not necessary here to explain, he is represented as the *Creator of the world*. There is, it is acknowledged, a *new creation*, the *regeneration of mankind*: of which, under the *Christian dispensation*, he is

* John i. 12. † Vol 1. pp. 195, 196. ‡ John i. 2, 9, 14, 15, 30.

the Author. Mr. G. thinks that if we “keep this in view in those passages which refer creation to our Saviour, we shall find that a *spiritual* creation is *invariably* meant.”*—We will make the experiment.

1. St. John says, “the *Word* was made *flesh*, and dwelt among us.”† Of this *Word* he says, “*All* things were *made* by him; and without him was not *any* thing *made* that *was made*.” Again: “He was in the world, and the world (*εγένετο*) was made by him, even the world which knew him not.”‡ To surmount this difficulty, Mr. G. appeals to the “new version,” in which the *Socinians*, to exemplify the *versatility* of their talents, and their expertness in the art of *interpolation*, render the same word, in the former passage “done,” and in the latter “was,” adding the word *enlightened*. We need not a better example of the manner in which they set aside the plainest declarations of scripture, by foisting in any word which will answer their purpose! A *translation* may be made, which will admit such a *Socinian* interpolation; but the original *Greek*, *untranslated*, absolutely forbids it. The verb, *to be*, when it means *to exist*, may be a translation of *γίνομαι*. But *γίνομαι*, like the English verb, *to exist*, is not the *auxiliary* verb by which the passive verb is formed. According to the proper meaning of St. John’s words, “All things *were* (existed) by him, and the world *was* (existed) by him.

2. The Apostle to the Hebrews, speaks of him as “being the *brightness* of the glory (of God,) and the express *image* of his person; and attributes to him the *creation*.||—By whom also he *made the world*.”§ Will Mr. G. say, that the *Christian* world is meant? Let him read the following verses. “But unto the Son he saith,—Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the *earth*; and the *heavens* are the work of thy hands. They shall *perish*, but thou remainest; and they shall all wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be *changed*.¶¶ Here are two plain proofs that the literal creation is meant. (1.) The Apostle declares that the *worlds* which *he* created are “the *earth*,” and “the *heavens*.” (2.) He declares that

* Vol. I. p. 341.

|| Heb. i. 3.

† John i. 14.

§ V. 2.

‡ John i. 3, 10.

¶¶ Heb. i. 2, 3, 8, 12.

the worlds which he made shall “*wax old,—be changed,* and “*perish.*” All this is perfectly true of the *material* worlds; but the *new creation abideth for ever.*

3. Let us hear the Apostle to the *Colossians*.—“His dear Son,—who is *the image of the invisible God*, the first-born of every creature: For by him were *all things created*, that are in *heaven*, and that are in *earth*, *visible* and *invisible*, whether they be *thrones*, or *dominions*, or *principalities*, or *powers*; *all things were created by him*, and *for him*: and he is *before all things*.”*—Mr. G. says, “A thought has been suggested by the late Dr. W. Harris, that the word *πρωτόκος*, by a change in the accent, is sometimes used by profane writers, not in a *passive*, but an *active* sense. Thus some would render it, not the *first-born*, but the *beginner*, or the first *bringer-forth*, the immediate *cause* of all things in the *new creation*.† So Mr. G. has answered the argument which he has elsewhere (Vol. I. p. 354) drawn from this word, “*first-born*.” But why apply the words only to the *new creation*? The Apostle says, “*all things were created by him*.” If we understand that passage *literally*, we have some idea of what is meant by “*heaven and earth*,” and “*all things that are in them*.” We can distinguish between things “*visible and invisible*: and can suppose that the rest of the Apostle’s expressions relate to the heavenly *hierarchies*. But if all this be said of what Mr. G. calls “*a spiritual creation*,” or of the *regeneration* of the *Christian* world, how are we to apply these terms? Are we to understand by things in *heaven*, and on *earth*, the *spiritualities*, and the *temporalities* of the church? Then he is the author of the *good livings*. Do the things *visible and invisible* mean the *bodies*, and the *souls*, of mankind? Then, at least, mankind are not all *matter*: nor is this creation all “*spiritual*.” But what are the *thrones*, *dominions*, *principalities*, and *powers*? Are they *metropolitans*, *bishops*, *deacons*, and *vicars*? Some such explanation will follow. But why then do the *Unitarians* set themselves as violently against the *episcopal* *hierarchy*, as against the *Divinity* of him from whom they suppose it to have originated?

* Col. i. 13—17.

† Vol. I. p. 340.

The *creation of the world* by Jesus Christ, as it is an unanswerable proof of his *pre-existence*, is equally a demonstration of his *supreme Godhead*. The *Socinians* themselves grant, that he is the “Author, and the Finisher, of a *new creation*.” But if, with the Apostle Peter, while we expect that the day of the Lord will come, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat ; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up—we also, according to his promise, look for *new heavens* and a *new earth* ; * if we look for a *new creation* of our *souls* in the *image of God*, and of our *bodies*, which shall be fashioned *like unto his glorious body* ; we must allow, that wisdom, and power, *no less* than were employed in the *old creation*, will be necessary to realize our expectations. Whether, therefore, he be the Author of the *old* or of the *new creation* ; or, as we believe, of *both* ;—“he that built *all things*,” whether the edifice of the *universe*, or that of the *Christian church*,—“is GOD.” †

Taking Mr. G. for our guide to truth as far as he is willing to go, we shall now embrace the full advantage of his own important concession. In explaining St. John’s doctrine on the incarnation of “the *Word of God*,” he says, “he (St. John) introduces the Messenger of the covenant, the *Messiah*, by saying, That the *PERFECTIONS* of *DEITY* became *flesh* ; *were imparted to a real man*. To this *man* he proceeds to ascribe the possession of *light*, and *life*, and *DIVINE PERFECTIONS*.” ‡

“*Great is truth, and will prevail!*” To grant *divine perfections* to the Son of God, is to confess, in spite of *Socinianism*, his *proper* and *supreme Divinity*. Before we argue this point, however, let us enquire, What are the *Divine Perfections* which “are ascribed” to him ?

1. *Unbeginning existence*, or *proper eternity*. “But thou, *Bethlhem Ephratah*, out of thee shall *he* come forth unto me that is to be ruler in *Israel*; whose *goings forth* (have been), *from of old, from EVERLASTING*.” ||

* 2 Pet. iii. 10—13.

‡ Vol. I. p. 200.

† Heb. iii. 4.

|| Mic. 5. 2

2. *Omnipresence.* “Lo, I am *with you always*, even unto the end of the world.”*—For where two or three are gathered together in my name, *there am I in the midst of them.*†—That Christ may *dwell in your hearts.*”‡—Mr. G. argues concerning the *Devil*, that if he is *every where*, at *all times present with you*, he is possest of “the Divine attribute of *omnipresence.*”|| The inference is equally just, with respect to *Jesus Christ.*

3. *Omniscience.* “He *knew all*; and needed not that any should testify of man: for “*he knew what was in man.* §—Lord, thou *knowest all things.*”¶ Mr. G. when the *Devil* is the subject of his argument, asks, “Does he not dive into your most *secret thoughts?* Has he not access to your *hearts?* What is this *but the Divine attribute of omniscience?*”**

4. *Omnipotence.* “Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby *he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.*”††—“*Omnipotence* (Mr. G. says) is a power of control over all other beings.”††

5. *Immutability.* “Jesus Christ the *same* yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.”|||

6. *All the Divine perfections.* “All things that the Father hath, are *mine.*” §§

Such are the Divine *perfections* which the sacred writers attribute to the Son of God. The *Socinians* suppose him to possess these Divine *perfections*, without possessing the Divine *nature.* It may serve an hypothesis, for a theologian to make a *mental abstraction* of the one from the other, and to imagine them disposable at his discretion; but in so doing he ought to know, that his imagination has created what has no real existence.

1. What idea have we of *God*, but of his *perfections?* The complex idea which we have of any being, is the aggregate of our ideas of its known qualities. What is *eter-*

* Matt. xxviii. 20.

† Matt. xviii. 20.

‡ Eph. iii. 17.

|| Vol. I. p. 19.

§ John ii. 24, 25.

¶ John xxi. 17.

** Vol. I. p. 19.

†† Phil. iii. 21.

†† Vol. I. p. 12.

||| Heb. xiii. 8.

§§ John xvi. 15.

nal, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, immutable, and all-perfect, Being, but God? Remove these attributes, and the word *being*, and the idea which it conveys, if any, is applicable to realities or non-entities, to any thing or nothing; and depends entirely on the ideas we attach to it. *Being*, without attributes, is nothing: and wherever the attributes are, there the being is. *God* is his *perfections*; and his *perfections* are *God*.

2. If God be supposed to *delegate his perfections* to another being, what is supposed to become of his *Godhead*? Is he any longer *God*, when he has so disposed of his *eternity, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, immutability, and all his perfections*?—Thus the *Socinians* rob the *Father* of his *Divinity*!

3. If God give his *perfections* to another being, then that being is *God*. As the *Socinians* suppose that the *Father* gave his *perfections* to the *human* nature of Jesus Christ, they thus suppose the *human* nature converted into the *Divine*! Let them then take to themselves the absurdity which they falsely impute to us.

4. If the Divine *perfections* can be *divided* between the *Father* and the *Son*, then they are *Divine* *perfections* no longer; because the line of division describes a *boundary*, and a *boundary* is inconsistent with *infinity*. Then, neither the *Father*, nor the *Son*, is *God*; for neither of them has *infinite* *perfections*. The *Socinians* thus rob both the *Father*, and the *Son*!

5. If they suppose that Divine *perfections* are not diminished by division, and that the *Father gives* to the *human* nature of Jesus Christ, his own *perfections*, and yet *retains* them; then they make *two Gods instead of one*.

6. But the Divine *perfections* cannot be possessed without the Divine *Nature*. To *men*, who are but *finite* beings, God can give a *beginning, dependent, finite, and stable*, existence. He can make them *knowing, wise, and powerful*. But (with reverence) he cannot give to them his *infinite* *perfections*. Their minds are *finite*, and therefore incapable of *infinity*. If Jesus Christ were a *mere man*, he could not possess the Divine *perfections*, because, as a *mere man*, he

is a mere *finite being*. To possess the infinite *perfections* of Deity, he must possess his infinite *nature*. Can a being who *began* to exist, be *without beginning*? Can a being who is necessarily *limited*, be *omnipresent*? Can any thing less than an *infinite* mind know *all* things? Can any but an “*uncontrolled* and *all-controlling mind*” be *omnipotent*? Or can any thing but an *all-perfect* mind be *immutable*?—In attributing Divine perfections to the Son of God, the *Socinians* do therefore, implicitly, if not explicitly, attribute to him *proper Divinity*; for there can be no *Divinity* more *proper* than *that* which possesses *Divine perfections*.

7. When the *Socinians* are not immediately engaged in impugning the *Divinity* of *Jesus Christ*, they can perceive the *truth* of these observations. Thus Mr. G. after enumerating the *supposed* infinite attributes of the *Devil*, says, “These *attributes* are all *divine*. And if there actually be a being possessing these *attributes*, that being ought to be a *DEITY*.”*

8. The sacred writers, while they attribute to the Son of God the Divine *perfections*, are *consistent*, and *confirm* our argument by attributing to him the Divine *Nature*. “For it pleased (the Father) that in him should *all fulness* dwell.”† “For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the *Godhead* bodily :”‡ (or, as Dr. *Doddridge* says, *substantially*: the word being used figuratively, and including *all* the Deity, as the word, *bodily*, implies the whole corporeal part of man.) To this Mr. G. objects. (1.) “It pleased the Father.”||—He does not speak out. Does he mean to object, that the dwelling of the *Godhead* in the *human* nature, was dependent on the *will* of the Father? We grant it. But this does not disprove the *fact*. (2.) He urges, that “whatever this fulness means, it is evident that it was not *peculiar* to Christ, but might be possessed by the disciples of Jesus; ‘that ye might be *filled* with all the *fulness* of God?’”—To this we answer, that the fulness of the Deity does dwell in *Christ*, in a manner *peculiar* to him. First, the Scriptures every where make an important distinction, the purport of which is, that the Deity dwells *primarily* in Christ, but only

* Vol. I p. 20.

† Col. I. 19.

‡ Col. ii. 9.

|| Vol. p. 244.

in a *secondary* sense in us: i. e. that whereas God dwells *immediately* in him, he dwells in us *mediately, through Christ*, and by virtue of our union with *Christ*. Thus, we are made “an *habitation of God, through the Spirit,*” by being “*built on Jesus Christ, the chief corner stone.*” * We are “filled *εἰς* into † all the fulness of God,” when “*Christ dwells in our hearts by faith.*” ‡ We are but the *members* of his mystical body, the church, of which *he* is the *head*. “Now ye are the body of Christ, and *members* in particular.” || But God hath “given *him* (to be) the *head* over all (things) to the church, which is his body, (who is) the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” § As the spirit of man is supposed to be immediately united with the head, the Deity is immediately united with *him*. *He* is, in his *human* nature, “the *head*,” who is, in his *Divine* Nature, at the same time, “the *fulness* of him that *filleth all in all.*” As the *spirit of man* dwells *mediately* and in a *secondary* sense in the *members*, which are thereby vivified, and actuated, by virtue of their union with the *head* in which it *primarily* and *immediately* dwells; so “of *his* fulness have we all received, and grace for grace.” ¶ Secondly, The *fulness* of the Godhead dwells in *him*. “That in all things he might have the pre-eminence, it pleased the Father that in him should *all fulness* dwell.” So says Mr. G. as well St. Paul. “In Jesus Christ,” says the former, “bodily, as a man, the *fulness* of Deity did reside. He possessed the Spirit *without measure.*” ** (It is true, he endeavours to contradict this position, by calling the fulness of the Deity, “*full and complete divine powers.*” Such is the effect of *Socinian* bondage! But the confession was extorted by the severity of truth.)—We, on the other hand, only *participate* (so to speak) the Divine fulness, as it pleases Jesus Christ to impart it. “Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.” ††

* Eph. ii. 20, 22.

† The Greek reads, ΕΙΣ εἰς το πληρωμα το Θεο: into all the fulness of God. So the *Socinians* have rendered it in the margin of their “*improved version.*” The allusion may possibly be to a vessel plunged into the ocean, and which is at once *filled* and *immersed*; it is filled *into* the fulness of the sea.

‡ Eph. iii. 17, 19.

¶ John i. 16.

|| 1 Cor. xiii. 27.

** Vol. I. p. 344.

§ Eph. i. 22, 23.

†† Eph. iv. 7.

"In him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead substantially." We are "filled with him :" "filled," according to our capacity, not *with* but *in*, "into all the fulness of God."*

9. In connection with this doctrine of the plenitude of the Godhead in Christ, we are now to consider their union with each other. "I and the Father," said Jesus Christ, "are one."† This union of the Father and the Son, Mr. G. affects to place on a level with "the oneness of Christ and the apostles."‡ The sacred writers will settle this point.

"The head of every man is Christ ; and the head of the woman is the man ; and the head of Christ is God."|| By one figure, viz. the relation of the human head to the human body, three subjects are here illustrated. (1.) In matrimonial union, "the man is the head of the woman." (2.) In the *mystical body of Christ*, of which every believer is a member, Jesus Christ is the head. "The head of every man is Christ." (3.) There is an ineffable union between God and his Christ : "his Son Jesus whom he has anointed with the *Holy Ghost above his fellows*." In this union, "the head of Christ is God :" the *human* nature is subordinate, the *Divine* is supreme.

The union of a man with his wife, and that of Christ with his church are compared with each other.—"The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church."§ Mr. G. may say, that the one is an *explanation* of the other.¶ Be it so. The explanation does not reduce them to a level. The man and his wife "are one flesh;" but "he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit."**—In like manner, the union of God with his Christ, and that of

* Mr. G. has a note on 2 Pet. i. 4. "That by these ye might be partakers of the *Divine Nature*." With Mr. Belsham, he thinks that "this expression is stronger than any which are used of Christ, and which, if it had been applied to him, would have been held forth as an irrefragable proof of his proper deity." (Vol. I. p. 418) We ask their pardon. Such an expression would have proved the *contrary*. St. Peter's words assert only that Christians *partake* the divine nature. If Jesus Christ merely *partook* the divine nature, "the fulness of the Godhead" would not then "dwell in him bodily."

† John x. 30.

‡ Vol. I. p. 329.

|| I. Cor. xi. 3.

§ Eph. v. 23.

¶ Vol. I. p. 328.

** 1 Cor. vi. 17.

Christ with his church are compared :—“ that they also may be one with us :—that they may be one, *even as* we are one.” This Mr. G. calls an “*explanation*.” But, as in the former case, though the union of the members of Christ with each other and with him, is explained by the union of Christ with God, the explanation does not reduce the things compared to a level with each other. No man could ever produce such proofs of his intimate union with Christ, as Christ produced of his intimate union with God. “ If ye had known *me*, ye should have known my *Father* also: and from henceforth ye *know* him, and have *seen* him. Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known *me*? He that has seen *me*, hath seen the *Father*; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the *Father*! Believest thou not that *I am in the Father*, and *the Father in me*?—The words that *I speak unto you*, I speak not of *myself*: but the *Father*, that *dwellleth in me*, he *doeth the works*.^{*} We cannot represent the union of the body and mind of man, by stronger terms than these. Mr. G.’s objections (Vol. I. p. 337.) are aimed against a different application of this passage. The reader must be cautious, however, not to mistake the present application of it. It is designed to shew, not that the *Divine* and the *human nature*, are *one nature*; but that the *Divine* perfections manifested in Christ, proved his union, not merely with the *abstract* *Divine* perfections, *but with the Divine Nature*. And this last is what, in referring to the proofs of his oneness with God, Jesus Christ has taught us to infer. “ If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not,” when I say, “ I and the *Father* are *one*;—but if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works [in which omnipotence is exerted;] that ye may know and believe, that *the Father is in me*, and *I in him*.[†]

10. As the scriptures attribute to the Son of God the fulness of the Deity, and an intimate union with the God-head; so they ascribe to his pre-existent nature, an *equality* with God. “ Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be *equal* with God.” [‡]

* John xiv. 5—10.

† John x. 37, 38.

‡ Phil. ii. 6.

(1.) Our first business here, is with the meaning of the terms. Mr. G. says, the word “*equal*,” being used *adverbially*, should have been translated “*like*.^{*} Waving the want of precision in this statement, the word “*like*” is either an *adjective* or an *adverb*. Mr. G. shuffles it in as an *adverb*, and yet uses it *adjectively*. Why then does he prefer an *improper* to a *proper* translation? For the sake of *ambiguity*. The word, *like*, may imply either *equality* or *similarity*. He adopts it under the pretence of its being synonymous with *equal*, and then takes advantage of its *ambiguity*. We, therefore, retain the word “*equal*,” for the sake of the genuine sense of the Apostle. Mr. G. next observes, that the passage should be rendered, “he did not esteem it a *prey* or *plunder*, the circumstance of being like (*equal with*) God![†] Permit, then, the word *plunder*, to be substituted for the word *robbery*; the words still mean that the circumstance of *equality* with God, was properly *his own*.—Conscious that nothing is yet gained, Mr. G. now practises the art of *interpolation*. “Who, being in the form of God, did not esteem the circumstance of his being like (*equal with*) God, a prey FOR HIS OWN PRIVATE GRATIFICATION.” This is genuine *Socinianism*! After all, however, he grants that *Jesus Christ* was *equal with* God, (or *like* God, if that word convey the same meaning;) although, according to him, the Saviour of men did not turn that circumstance to his own private account.

(2.) To make a way for these criticisms, Mr. G. has contrasted with this apostolice declaration, those passages which set forth the *inferiority* and *subordination* of the *Son* to the *Father*. As he has in his Supplements to No. VI. and No. VII. several passages of similar import, which he has *often repeated*, and all of which are levelled at this *equality*, we will here give to them all a general answer.

When St Paul speaks of “*Christ Jesus*, who, being in the *form of God*, thought it not robbery to be *equal with God*,” he speaks distinctly of his *pre-existent* nature; for he proceeds to say, that he (subsequently) “made himself of no

* Vol. I. p. 333.

† Vol. I. p. 333.

reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." *

If, after his being made in the likeness of men, we find him in a state very different from that which preceded, we no longer wonder. To the *human* nature, which he thus took upon him, we do not, like our opponents, ascribe those Divine perfections which we attribute to his *pre-existent* nature. His human nature had a *beginning*, and therefore was not "from everlasting." It was not *independent*, but *dependent*, and therefore "lived by the Father," died, and was *raised again by the Father*. This nature therefore *prayed*, and gave *thanks*, to the Father. It was not *omnipresent*, and therefore could be "*exalted to God's right hand*." It was not *omniscient*, and therefore "*increased in wisdom*," and "*knew not that day and that hour*." It was not *omnipotent*, and therefore it could *of itself* "do nothing;" for all the power it had was "*given by the Father*." It was not *immutable*, and therefore *died, revived*, and was *exalted*. But all this does not hinder that these perfections, which Mr. G. *absurdly* attributes to his *human nature*, should still be attributed to his *pre-existent* and *Divine Nature*.

In his state of humiliation, he who was *before in the form of God*, and counted it not robbery to be *equal* with God, was *now in the form of a servant*, and in the *likeness of men*. This *assumed* nature stood in a *subordinate* and *inferior* relation. Hence he spoke of God as his *God*, and his *Father*, and of himself as the *Servant* and *Son*, and acknowledged "the Father is *greater than I*;" for the *Divine Nature* is *superior* to the *human*. Hence he spoke of himself as *sent* by the Father, *taught* by the Father, *commanded* by the Father, *obeying* the Father, *not honouring himself* but the Father, having a kingdom *appointed by* the Father, and being *glorified* by the Father. This *inferior* and *subordinate nature* must finally "*give up to the Father the kingdom*" which he has *received* from him, "*that God may be all in all*." But all this does not prove that his *pre-existent* nature was *not in the form of God*, and

* Phil. ii. 7.

equal with God; or that it ever will be *inferior* or *subordinate*.*

As *Jesus Christ* possesses the Divine Nature, and the Divine perfections, he is frequently denominated *God*.

1. We have already seen that the pre-existent nature of Christ is what is called the *WORD*. St. John says, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and *the Word was God*.”† This passage, Mr. G. observes, “was written in opposition to the *Gnostic* doctrine of *æons*, of the separate existences of wisdom, and life, and light; and to maintain, that they were *one* and the same *being*, all *God himself*.”‡ In his comment therefore he has these words: “and the *Word* was *no other than God himself*:”|| This *Word*, then, which he here says “*was no other than God himself*,” “*was made flesh, and dwelt among us*; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.”—Where then is Mr. G.’s *modesty*, when he asserts, “that even *John* does not tell us *plainly and positively*,—that there were *two natures* in *Jesus Christ*, a *divine*, and a *human*? ”§

2. Hence, after his incarnation, he was called “*Emmanuel*; which being interpreted, is, *God with us*:” ¶ i. e. “*no other than God himself*,” dwelling among us in *human flesh*.

3. Thomas, therefore, might well exclaim to him, “*My LORD, and my God*.** If the Word incarnate “*was no other than God himself*” in *human flesh*, this exclamation was the result of conviction. But Mr. G. dexterously

* Mr. G. objects to the Divinity of our Lord, that “*Jesus Christ must be dependent upon God, and inferior to him, because he declares that he had not the disposal of the highest places in his own kingdom.*” Matt. xx. 23. (Vol. I. p. 355.) Some men would have felt a little uneasy, in urging an objection which contradicts itself, by supposing a *sovereign* not to be *supreme* “*in his own kingdom*.” If Mr. G. feel any thing of this, he may soon be relieved, by being informed, that the words “*it shall be given to them*,” are supplied by the translators, and that the meaning of the passage is—“*to sit on my right hand and on my left, is not mine to give, except to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.*”

+ John i. 1. ‡ Vol. I. p. 260. || Vol. I. p. 197.

§ Vol. I. p. 433. ¶ Matt. i. 23. ** John xx. 28.

divides the exclamation into two, the first part was addressed to *Jesus*, “O my Master! or, O my Lord!” * the second, (in which, to assist the reader’s imagination, he supposes *Thomas* to lift up his hands,) addressed to the *Father*, “O my God!” He then admires his own ingenuity.—But if this had been the meaning of the Evangelist, he must have said, “And *Thomas* answered and said unto *him*, My Lord! and he said unto the *Father*, My God!” But unhappily for the honour of *Socinianism*, St. John distinctly states, that the whole exclamation was addressed to *Jesus*. “And Thomas answered, and said unto him, My Lord, and my God!”

4. Nor could Thomas be blameable in using a term which *God* himself has used.—“But unto the *Son* (he saith) Thy throne, O *God*, is for ever and ever.” †—The first difficulty which Mr. G. imagines in this passage, is, that we suppose “*Jehovah* to be addressing *Jehovah*.” It is just as easy as for *God* to say, “Let us make man.”—The second is, that the *Son* is here compared with his “*fellow*,” viz. *mankind*.—We grant that he who is here called *God*, is also the “*fellow*” of *men*. But *Jehovah* calls him also a *man* who is his “*fellow*.” “Awake, O my sword, against my Shepherd, and against the *man* (that is) *my fellow*.” ‡ To help us over these difficulties, Mr. G. proposes a new translation. We are always on our guard against *Socinian* translations; but quote them for their absurdities. He would translate it, “*God* is thy throne.” || In another place, Mr. G. has quoted these words, “*him that sat on the throne*,” as descriptive of “*God* with a peculiarly high title or epithet.” § He had then forgotten that “*the Lamb* is in the *midst* of the *throne*.” ¶ Here, he is absurd enough to suppose that *God* is the *throne* in the *midst* of which he sits. But he that *sits* upon the *throne* is *greater* than the *throne*. So rather than the *Son* shall be called *God*, he shall be even *greater* than *God*. After all this, Mr. G. objects, “It is only a quotation, and is uttered of *Solomon*,” ** in answer to which, the Author of the Epistle, who understood the

* Vol. I. p. 204. † Heb. i. 8. ‡ Zech. xiii. 7. || Vol. I. p. 210.

§ Vol. I. p. 276. ¶ Rev. vii. 17. ** Vol. I. p. 210.

matter better than Mr. G., says that they are the words of *God*, addressed “*to the Son*.”

5. It is therefore a scriptural truth, that, when “the Word of God,” who according to Mr. G. is “no other than God himself,—was made flesh,—God was manifest in the *flesh*.^{*} The learned are not agreed whether the genuine reading of this passage be *Ος*, or *Θς*, *who*, or *God*. As Mr. G. appeals to the “Eclectic Reviewers, who admit that Θεος, *God*, is not the genuine reading,” † it will not be improper on this occasion to submit the subject to their authority. “We confess,” say they, “that our judgment is in favour of *ος*, (*who*). But we object strongly to the rendering in the Improved Version, (which Mr. G. follows,) ‘*He who* was manifested in the flesh, was justified by the Spirit,’ &c. The editors have followed Abp. *Newcome*, in supposing that *ος* may be put elliptically for *ουτος ος*. This supposition, we apprehend, is quite unauthorized and erroneous. Till some better support is adduced for this assumed ellipsis, we must reject it as *false Greek*. In the place before us, *ui* is undoubtedly a *relative*; and its natural and proper antecedent has been pointed out by the learned Professor *Cramer*, distinguished thus:—*ητις εστιν εκκλησια ΘΕΟΥ ζωντος (στυλος και εδραιωμα της αληθειας, και ομολογουμενως μεγα, εστι το της ευσεβειας μυστηριου) ος εφανερωθη, κ. τ. λ.* “Which is the church of the living God (the pillar and support of the truth, and confessedly great, is the mystery of godliness) *who* was manifested,” &c. ‡ Leaving out the parenthesis, we have the proposition, “*God, who* was manifest in the flesh.”

“But do you mean that the *invisible* God was actually *visible* to mortal eyes?” No: we do not mean that *He* was manifested to *bodily* eyes, but that the Divine Nature was manifested to the *mental* eyes of those who *knew* Jesus Christ *aright*. He that thus “*saw the Son, saw the Father also*,” even as Moses “*saw him that is invisible* ;” for “*the Father was in him, and he was in the Father*.” Oh, says Mr. G., “then I firmly *believe* the passage. I believe

* 1 Tim. iii. 16.

† Vol. I. p. 217

‡ Ecl. Rev. Vol. V. Part I. p. 248.

that God *was* manifest in the *flesh*, in the *man* Jesus Christ.” *

————— non immemor artis,
Omnia transformat sese in miracula rerum.

6. Our Saviour is repeatedly called God. For example: “The doctrine of God our Saviour.” †—Again: “The kindness of God our Saviour;” who is immediately denominated “Jesus Christ our Saviour.” ‡ Let it be observed, once for all, that “neither is there *salvation* in any other” than “*Jesus Christ of Nazareth*;—for there is *none other name under heaven, given among men whereby we must be saved.*” ||— Again: δικαιοσύνη ΤΟΥ Θεού ημών καὶ σωτῆρος ημῶν, Ιησος Χριστός, the righteousness of our God and Saviour, (viz.) Jesus Christ.” § As this construction will frequently fall in our way, it must be here considered. (1.) When *two* persons are intended, the demonstrative article is *repeated*. Thus: Κατὰ ΤΟΥ Κυρίου, καὶ κατὰ ΤΟΥ Χειστοῦ αὐτοῦ, “against the Lord, and against his Christ.” ¶ Ο Θεος καὶ ΤΟ αρνιον “God, and the Lamb.” ** Ex τοῦ θρόνου ΤΟΥ θεού, καὶ τοῦ αρνιοῦ: “from the throne of God, and of the Lamb.” †† (2.) When the demonstrative article is *not* repeated, *one person only* is intended. Thus: Βασιλειαν ΤΟΥ Κυρίου ημών καὶ σωτῆρος, Ιησου Χριστοῦ “the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” ‡‡ Γνωσει ΤΟΥ Κυρίου ημών καὶ σωτῆρος, Ιησου Χριστοῦ “the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.” |||| ΤΩ δε Θεω καὶ πατρι ημών: “to God and our Father.” §§ ΤΩ Θεω, καὶ πατρι “to God, even the Father.” ¶¶ “Mr. Wordsworth avers, “I have observed more, I am persuaded, than a thousand instances of the form Ο Χριστός καὶ Θεος, (Eph. v. 5.) some hundred of instances of ο μεγας Θεος καὶ σωτης, (Tit. ii. 13.) and not fewer than several thousands of the form ο θεος καὶ σωτηρ, (2 Pet. i. 1.) While in no single case have I seen, where the sense could be determined, any one of them used, but only of one person.” ***—Thus, as in the passage under consideration the article is *not* repeated, only

* Vol. I. p. 216. † Titus ii. 10. ‡ Tit. iii. 4, 6. || Acts iv. 10, 12, 13.

§ 2 Pet. i. 1. ¶ Acts iv. 26. ** Rev. xxi. 22. †† Rev. xxii. 1.

‡‡ 2 Pet. i. 11. ||| 2 Pet. iii. 18. §§ Phil. 4. 20. ¶¶ 1 Cor. xv. 24.

*** Middleton on the Greek Article.

one person is spoken of: "our God," and "our Saviour," is *one* person, viz. "Jesus Christ."—For the same reason in Eph. v. 5. the *original* affords another proof of the Divinity of Christ. The words are, *εν τη Βασιλειᾳ ΤΟΥ Χριστου και Θεου*, in the kingdom of the Christ and God.

But Mr. G. repeatedly objects that "Jesus Christ was once charged with making himself God, when he positively denied the charge." * The fact is this; *Jesus Christ* had spoken of God as his *Father*; implying that he was the *Son of God*. By this expression the *Jews* understood him as making himself a *divine* person, i. e. *God*; and were about to stone him. Now *Jesus* did *not deny* that his expression implied that he is *God*; which, as he never gave unnecessary offence, he undoubtedly would have done, if truth had permitted it. But he vindicated what he had said, by an *argumentum ad homines*, and by an appeal to the works of the Father which were done by himself; and deduced the inference, that the Father is in him, and he in the Father: i. e. that they were intimately *one*. See John x. 30—38. †

When angels or men are called *gods*, the appellation is used with such *qualifying circumstances* as sufficiently indicate a *subordinate* sense. To the angels it is said, "Worship him," (viz. the Son of God) "all ye gods." ‡ "God standeth in the congregation of the *mighty*; he *judgeth* among the *gods*.—I have said, ye are *gods*; *but ye shall die like men*." || "I have *made* thee a *god* to Pharaoh." §—Now if it can be made to appear that the *pre-existent* nature of Christ is called *God* under similar qualifying circumstances, we will give up the doctrine of his Divinity. But this is impossible. Who can more *properly be* *God*, or be *called* *God*, than he who has all the *Divine perfections*, and the

* Vol. I. p. 220.

† Mr. G. says, Jesus Christ expressly denies that he was *God*, when he exclaims, "Why callest thou *me good*? There is none good but *one*, that is *God*. Matt. xix. 17." Vol. I. p. 356.—This passage is cited repeatedly by Mr. G. and his coadjutors, and generally with an air of triumph. Do they know that *Griesbach* has the words, "Why askest thou me concerning good? One only is good." And that this is the translation given by their great supporters, the Authors of the "New and improved Version?" If these *Critics* be in the right, Mr. G. must be very much in the wrong.

‡ Psalm. xvii. 7. || Psalm. lxxxii. 1, &c. § Ex. vii. 1.

Divine Nature? Under such circumstances, when *Jesus Christ* is denominated *God*, it is not necessary to seek such palliatives as are called for when the same appellation is given to angels or to men. But, to place it beyond all reasonable doubt that the name of *God* is not applied to Jesus Christ in a *subordinate* sense, the sacred writers frequently apply it in connection with such epithets as confine their meaning to the *one*, *supreme*, and *eternal* God. He is styled the *true*, the *great*, the *only wise*, the *mighty*, the *supreme*, and *ever-blessed* God.

1. He is denominated the *true* God. This is an epithet which when joined with the word *God*, Mr. G. contends, is descriptive of the proper Divinity of *God the Father*.* Yet the very passage which he quotes is written in reference to Jesus Christ. “And we know that the *Son of God* is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know the *true* one. And we are in the *true* one, even in *his Son* Jesus Christ. *This is the true God*, and eternal life.”†—Mr. G. renders it, “*by his Son Jesus Christ*.” The word, however, is the same which is translated, “*in* the *true* one :” they must therefore both be translated, *in*. This *unwarranted alteration* being withdrawn, the passage asserts as clearly and decisively as possible: First, that Jesus Christ is the *true one*; and, Secondly, that he is the *true God*.

2. He is denominated the *great* God. “Looking (says St. Paul,) for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the *great* God, and our *Saviour*, Jesus Christ.”‡

This passage obviously speaks of Jesus Christ. But Mr. G. has attempted to prove the contrary, by prefixing the sign of the genitive case before the words, “our Saviour.” This, however, is one of those passages in which the article is *not repeated*: See p. 85. The words are, ΤΟΥμεγαλου Θεου και σωτηρος νυνων, and might be translated, with the utmost precision, “of our *great* God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ.”

3. He is denominated the *only wise* God. “Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding

* Vol. I. p. 274.

† 1 John v. 20.

‡ Tit. ii. 13.

joy, to the *only wise* God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever.”* The reasons to be assigned for applying this doxology to Jesus Christ, are the following: (1.) Jesus Christ is our *only Saviour*. “There is *none other name* under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be *saved*.” But if Jesus Christ be *our only Saviour*, he must be “the *only wise God, our Saviour*.” (2.) It is he “that is able to *present us faultless* before the presence of *his glory*.—Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;—that he might *present it to himself a glorious church*, not having *spot or wrinkle*, or any such thing; but that it should be *holy*, and *without blemish*.” He, therefore, is “the *only wise God our Saviour*.”

4. He is denominated the *mighty* God. *Isaiah* predicts the coming of the Messiah, and says, “his name shall be called, the *Mighty God*.”† In this verse the prophet speaks of both the *human*, and the *divine*, nature of Jesus Christ. “Unto us a *child is born*, unto us a *Son is given*.” These words unquestionably refer to the *human* nature which he should “take on himself.” But the following words, “his name shall be called the *Mighty God*,” evidently refer to the *divine* nature. “The *Word of God*,” which, Mr. G. says, is “*no other than God himself*,” was to be “*made flesh*,” or to take upon him the *human* nature; and on account of that union of the *divine* nature with the *humun*, the “*child born*,” the “*Son given*,” should be called “the *Mighty God*.”

It is curious to attend to the palpable inconsistency of Mr. G.’s efforts to attach to the original words some other interpretation than that given by our translators. After a variety of *contradictory* criticisms, he candidly avows that he “feels no anxiety as to which of the interpretations be adopted.”‡ We give him full credit for his perfect *indifference*, as we know that the work of a *Socinian* is not to explain, but to confound. “The phrase,” he says, “might be translated—‘a *mighty Lord*,’ or ‘counsellor of *God*, *mighty*.’”|| That is: (1.) The word (*el*) should *not* be

* Jude 24, 25. † Isa. ix. 6. ‡ Vol. I. p. 501. || Vol. I. p. 194.

translated, God, but, Lord. (2.) It *may* be translated, God, if you will permit him to derange the whole passage. In another page, the terms, “*Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God,*” are all permitted to stand as a just translation, and are applied by him “*to the great Jehovah.*”* To use Mr. G.’s own words, “Is not this *saying* a thing, and then *unsaying* it again, which is *saying nothing at all?* If the *last* clause is to be believed, the *first* cannot, because the last is a *negation* of the first; and if the first is to be believed, for that very reason the last cannot.”† It would have been well if this had been the only proof which Mr. G. has given, that his business is not to attend to the voice of scripture, but to invalidate its testimony.

The reader will now be prepared to enquire, Why these laborious efforts to set aside the common translation, by a variety of contradictory criticisms? The answer is ready. Not because the common translation, which has the authority of Bp. Lowth, is not as proper as any other which has been given; but because the Socinians meet with many difficulties in the application of it. Those difficulties we shall now examine.

“With what propriety can the great Jehovah be the *subject of a prophecy*, as about to become something which *he is not*? Can an *immutable* being be subject to *change*? Can the *Omnipotent Creator* become a *creature*? Can the *Self-existent Jehovah*, become a *child*, an *infant-born*? What is to be understood when it is said that Jehovah is a Son *given*?‡

These are now for a specimen of Mr. G.’s difficulties. They are mere repetitions of the same idea couched in different terms. We cannot have a more clear demonstration than this that the Socinians, when they call for proof of the proper Divinity of Christ, expect us to *attempt*, at least, to prove that the *Divine* nature was *changed* into *human*, and that that *human* was still *divine*. This is precisely what they would insinuate to be our opinion. From hence they draw all the *supposed* absurdities of our system, and on this hypothesis they ground their principal objections. These queries may serve to convict of error, any who have formed

* Vol. I. p. 499.

† Vol. I. p. 360.

‡ Vol. I. p. 495.

such an opinion ; but they are not pointed at the doctrine of *judicious* Trinitarians. We do not believe that Jehovah *became* what he was not *before* : or that he underwent any *change* contrary to his essential *immutability*. We do not believe that the *Creator became a creature* : or that the *Self-existent* became a *child*. If Mr. G. ask us what we do believe, we answer in his own words, We believe that “the Word, which was no other than God himself, was made flesh,”* or took upon him the human nature. What can he object to this? This *human* nature was the subject of *prophecy* ; was the *child born* ; was the *Son given* by Jehovah ; was advanced to *power* and *dominion* : and his union with the *Divine* Nature rendered appropriate that appellation, “the Mighty God,” which belonged to the Divine Nature before that union.

Mr. G. is so sensible that he has not fixed any impropriety upon our translation, that he adopts one additional measure to get rid of it. “After all,” says he, “they are only names, as Elihu,—Gabriel,” &c So, at length, we find that Jesus Christ *is called the Mighty God*. If Mr. G. can find the place where this is made the *proper* name of Christ, he will not have proved what he aims at, till he has proved, that our Lord was not in *character* all that he was called by *name* : that he was not a Saviour who was called Jesus, and that he was not *anointed* who was called Christ.

One more objection of a different cast, deserves attention. “Can the Almighty *Father* of all, with any propriety, be called a *Son*? ” That is, how can Jesus Christ be a *Son*, and be his *own Father*? Not at all. But let Mr. G. rather ask, whether Jesus Christ may not be a *Son* in *one* sense, and a *Father* in *another*: “the *Son of God*,” and “the *Father of the everlasting age*? ”

5. He is denominated the *supreme* and *ever-blessed God*. —“Christ, who is *over all, God, blessed for ever*,”† These words always did, and ever will, stand in the way of the *Socinians*. But their motto is, *Nil desperandum*. The first thing to be done is, to bring this doctrine under suspicion by contrasting with it a passage which appears to them

* Vol. I. p. 197, 200.

† Rom. ix. 5.

to contradict it. The elect passage is this: "When all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the *Son* also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that *God* may be all in all." Here is the apparent contradiction. The difficulty, however, is easily solved by applying the doctrine of the *two-fold* nature of Christ. Here is a *human* nature which was "*of the Israelites*," which, after being "*obedient unto death*, even the death of the cross, was highly exalted, and received a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of (things) in heaven, and in earth, and under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." When all these things shall be subdued, this *human* nature shall also become subject to the *Divine*. On the other hand, here is, in the same person, a *Divine Nature* which existed *before* the incarnation, which *had glory with the Father before the world was*, and which shall be "*all in all*," when all shall have been subdued.—The next thing to be done is to *supply* the word $\varepsilon\tau\tau\omega$ *be*. The passage then becomes a pious ejaculation: "God who is over all, *be* blessed for ever!" But who gave to the *Socinians* this authority to add words of their own, whereby to pervert entirely the meaning of the words of God? The interpolation of a word is not, however, all that is necessary for the perversion of the meaning of this passage: the construction of it must also be altered. In an *ejaculatory* sentence, the participle is always put before the substantive." Εὐλογητος ο Θεος , is then the form, as in 1 Pet. i. 3. Eph. i. 3. Luke xix. 38. But, in a *declarative* sentence, the substantive or pronoun is put first. The form then is, $ος \varepsilon\tau\tauιν \text{ευλογητος}$, as in Rom. i. 25. $ο \Thetaεος$, $ο ων \text{ευλογητος}$, as in 2 Cor. xi. 31, or, $ο ων θεος \text{ευλογητος}$, as in the passage under examination. Jesus Christ, therefore, is not only the *blessed* God, but also the *supreme* God: "who is *over all* for evermore."

As Mr. G. has generously assisted us by several important concessions, he will now afford us further assistance by a large collection of passages which we shall quote from his Supplement. Having arranged them under different heads,

he has thereby stampt them with a peculiar character which will spare us a great deal of argumentation. The reader will please to observe, that the first passage of each of the following sections, is cited by Mr. G. in the place referred to, as properly descriptive of the *Divine Glory of God the Father.*

I. “Jehovah the one or only God.”

“ Jude 4. Denying the *only* Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.” *—This is one of those passages in which the article is *not* repeated, and which we have already shewn (p. 85.) speak only of *one* person. Our ($\delta\epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\eta$) *governor* God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, are therefore the *same*. But beside this, it is to be observed, that in a parallel passage Jesus Christ is spoken of as our ($\delta\epsilon\sigma\omega\tau\eta\eta$) *governor*. *Tον αγορασαντα αυτους δειπνωτην αρνουμενοι*: “denying the *governor* that bought them.” † This passage, Mr. G. has placed among those which distinguish the supreme God, by peculiar high titles and epithets. ‡ But Jesus Christ is he that *bought* them: “Thou wast *slain* and ($\pi\gamma\alpha\rho\pi\alpha\zeta\varsigma$) hast *bought* us to God by thy *blood*.” || Now, if he that *bought* us is our *governor*, and there is but *one* governor, God; it follows that Jesus Christ, who *bought* us with his *blood*, is our *one governor*, God.

“ 1 Tim. vi. 15. Who is the blessed and *only* Potentate, the *King of Kings*, and *Lord of Lords*.” §—The *same titles* are given to Jesus Christ. “These shall make war with the *Lamb*, and the *Lamb* shall overcome them; for *he* is *Lord of Lords*, and *King of Kings*.” ¶ “ His name is called the *Word of God*.—And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, *King of kings*, and *Lord of lords*.” ** If therefore the King of kings, and Lord of lords, is “the *blessed* and *only* Potentate; Jesus Christ is that *blessed* and *only* Potentate.

II. “God absolutely and by way of eminence.”

“ Luke xxii. 69. Hereafter shall the *Son of Man* sit on the right hand of the *power of God*.” ††—“ *Christ the power of God*.” ‡‡

* Vol. I. p. 227.

† 2 Pet. ii. 1.

‡ Vol. I. p. 275.

|| Rev. v. 9.

§ Vol. I. p. 227.

¶ Rev. xvii. 14.

** Rev. xix. 13.—16

†† Vol. I. p. 229.

‡‡ 1 Cor. i. 24.

"Mark ii. 7. Who can *forgive sins* but God only?"*—So Mr. G. quotes, as good authority for a *Socinian*, the enemies of our *Lord*.—"When Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee: or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man *hath power on earth to forgive sins*, (he saith to the sick of the palsy,) I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house."†

"Heb. xii. 23. God the judge of all."‡—"The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son."||

III. "God with peculiarly high titles and epithets."

"Matt. xxvi. 63. The *living* God. §—The word was God. In him was *life*."¶ And Mr. G. grants, that "*wisdom*, and *life*, and *light*, are all *one* and the *same* being, all *God himself*."**

"1 John ii. 20. Ye have an abomination from the Holy One. ††—Ye denied the Holy One," Jesus Christ. ‡‡

"Rev. i. 8. I am *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *beginning* and the *ending*, saith the Lord, which *is*, and which *was*, and which is to *come*, the *Almighty*."|||—This passage, which Mr. G. has cited as speaking, like the rest, of God with *peculiar high titles and epithets*, refers to Jesus Christ. It is the Lord that speaks of *himself*; and we are to remember that "to us there is but *one Lord*, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things.", §§ The same "*peculiar high titles and epithets*" are given to *him* in other places. "I am *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *beginning* and the *end*, the *first* and the *last*,—I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things." ¶¶—I am the *first* and the *last*: I am he that liveth and was *dead*; and behold I am alive for evermore. ***—These things saith the *first* and the *last*, which was *dead* and is alive." †††

* Vol. I. p. 229. † Mark ii. 7—11.

§ Vol. I. p. 269. ¶ John i. 1, 4.

†† Acts iii. 14. ||| Vol. I. p. 375.

** Rev. i. 17. ¶¶ Rev. i. 17. ¶¶

‡ Vol. I. p. 263.

|| John v. 22.

¶¶ Vol. I. p. 274.

||| Vol. I. p. 275.

¶¶ Vol. I. p. 275.

||| Vol. I. p. 275.

¶¶ Vol. I. p. 275.

||| Vol. I. p. 275.

“ Rev. iv. 11. Thou art worthy, O *Lord*, to receive glory, and honour, and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.”*—We repeat, that “ there is one *Lord*, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things;” to whom, therefore, these words are addressed. “ All things were created by him, and for him.”† “ Matt. xi. 25. I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth.”‡—Preaching peace by Jesus Christ: he is Lord of all.”||

“ James v. 4. The Lord of Sabaoth: i. e. of hosts.”§—This very title is given to Jesus Christ. “ These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory and spake of him.”¶ Now, in the account which Esaias gives of his vision, and from which the Evangelist made his quotation, the prophet calls him whose glory he had seen, the *Lord of hosts*. “ Mine eyes have seen the King, the *Lord of hosts*.”**

“ 1 Thess. ii. 4. God which trieth our hearts.”†† And “ Rom. viii. 27. He that searcheth the hearts.”‡‡—These things saith the *Son of God*, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire:—all the churches shall know that *I am he* that searcheth the reins and hearts.”|||

“ Acts iii. 13. God, which knoweth the hearts.”§§—“ But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men. And needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man.”¶¶||

“ 1 Tim. iv. 10. God who quickeneth all things,”***—“ For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.”†††

“ Rom. xv. 33. The God of peace be with you all.”+++—“ My peace I give unto you,” said Jesus Christ.|||| “ The Lord of peace, (the “ one Lord”) himself give you peace always by all means.” \$\$\$

IV. “ God Jehovah the sole object of religious adoration.”

It is not said, in any part of the sacred scriptures, that the Father *only* is the object of worship; but rather, “ that

* Vol. 1. p. 276. † Col. i. 16. ‡ Vol. I. p. 269. || Acts x. 35.

§ Vol. 1. p. 274. ¶ John xii. 41. ** Isa. vi. 5. †† Vol. I. p. 273.

‡‡ Vol. I. p. 271. ||| Rev. ii. 12, 23. §§ Vol. I. p. 271. ¶¶ John ii. 24, 25.

*** Vol. I. p. 274. ††† John v. 21. ‡‡‡ Vol. I. p. 272. ||||| John xiv. 27.

\$\$\$ Thess. iii. 16.

all men should honour the *Son*, even as they honour the Father ; and he that honoureth not the *Son*, honoureth not the Father.” * But let us hear.

“ John iv. 23. *The true worshippers shall worship the Father* in spirit and in truth ; for the *Father* seeketh such to worship him. †—When he bringeth in the *first-begotten* into the world, he saith, And let *all the angels* of God worship him.” ‡ So the *true worshippers* worship the *Son*, as well as the *Father*! The *wise men*, a *leper*, a *ruler*, the *woman of Canaan*, the *men in the ship*, the *disciples*, the *man out of the tombs*, and the *blind men*, all, in their turns, “worshipped” Jesus Christ. See Matt. ii. 11. viii. 2. ix. 18. xv. 25. xiv. 33. xxviii. 9. Mark v. 6. Luke xxiv. 52. John ix. 38. In all these places, we have the same word (*προσκυνεω*), which is used by our Lord in the passage Mr. G. has quoted as definitive of that worship which the *true worshippers* render to the *Father*. It is the word which Luke uses in speaking of the *worship* which Peter, “because he also was a (mere) man,” refused to accept from *Cornelius*. Acts x. 25. It is the same word which St. John uses when he speaks of the *worship* he was about to offer at the feet of the angel ; and which the angel uses, when he forbids it, and says, *Worship God*.—So scriptural it is “that all men should honour the *Son*, even as they honour the *Father*!” ||

“ Matt. vi. 6. When thou prayest, pray to thy *Father* which is in secret.” §—“ And they stoned Stephen, invoking, and saying, *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit*: And he *kneeled down*, and *cried* with a loud voice, *Lord, lay not this sin to their charge*.” ¶—What can be an act of higher adoration from the lips of a man, than this in which the proto-martyr at once committed to Christ his *departing spirit*, and prayed to him for the *forgiveness* of his enemies? “ Who (say Mr. G. and the perverse Jews) can *forgive sins*, but *God only*? ”—We proceed ;—“ The same *Lord* is rich unto all that *call upon him*. For whosoever shall *call on the name* of the *Lord*, shall be *saved*.” **—“ And the Apostles said

* John v. 23. † Vol. I. p. 231. ‡ Heb. i. 6. || John v. 23.

§ Vol. I. p. 279. ¶ Acts viii. 59, 60. ** Rom. x. 12, 13.

unto the *Lord*, *Increase our faith!*" * Mr. G. has cited a passage in which St. Paul prays to both the Father and the *Son*: "Now God himself, and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you?" † In these three passages, Jesus Christ is invoked as the God of *providence*, *grace*, and *salvation*: and that salvation is absolutely promised to them that *call upon him*.—Again: "When *Jesus* departed, two blind men followed him, saying, "Thou Son of David, have mercy on us!" ‡—This prayer Jesus graciously heard and answered. But Mr. G. and his coadjutors, having found these words in the *Litany* and not recognizing them as a quotation from scripture, but supposing them to be the words of some "Creed Maker," have condemned them as *idolatrous*, and "exhort all *Christian* people to abstain from such *worship*." || From hence we learn, (1.) That such a prayer is an act of *worship*. (2.) That offered to a mere creature it would be *idolatrous*. (3.) That Jesus Christ is *not* a mere creature, since the scriptures speak of such worship with approbation.—This is an undesignated, but striking proof, that the sentiments of a Christian agree very ill with a *Socinian*.

To all this Mr. G. objects, that "we are not justified in paying adoration to any other being, than that Being to whom our Saviour prayed, and whom he styles the *only true God*." §—This may be very just, when rightly applied. But, in answer to it, They who "know what they worship," "no longer know Jesus Christ after the flesh." As "in him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead," or, "*the only true God*;" to that fulness of the Godhead, their prayer is addressed, through him in whom he resides.

" We worship toward that Holy Place,
" In which he does his name record ;
" Does make his gracious nature known,
" That living Temple of his Son."

" Col. i. 12. Giving *thanks* to the *Father*." ¶—The very next passage, which Mr. G. gives, is, "Singing with

* Luke xvii. 5.

|| Vol. I. p. 397.

† Vol. I. p. 285.

§ Vol. I. p. 213.

‡ Matt. ix. 27.

¶ Vol. p. 285.

grace in your hearts to the *Lord* :”* viz. to Jesus Christ, the “*one Lord*.—I thank *Christ Jesus our Lord*, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry.”†

“2. Thess. i. 2. Grace unto you, and peace from *God* our *Father*.”‡—This text is to prove that Jehovah is the sole object of religious worship. Then Jesus Christ is *Jehovah*: for among many other passages which might be quoted, *mirabile dictu*, Mr. G. has himself quoted, for the same purpose, the following:—“Grace, mercy, and peace from *God the Father*, and *Christ Jesus our Lord*.”||

Mr. G. grants, that the term, “*Jehovah*,” is the term exclusively applied to the *one God*.§ “I am *Jehovah*; that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another.”¶ If therefore the Son be denominated *Jehovah*, he is the one supreme *God*.

1. In the following passages, the name, *Jehovah*, is given to the *Son*.

(1.) “The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of *Jehovah*.”**

(2.) “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me; and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in, behold he shall come, saith *Jehovah* of hosts.”††

These passages, according to the Evangelists, refer to John the Baptist, who was the harbinger of Christ, “the *Messenger of the covenant*,” and prepared the way before him. But the prophet predicts his crying, Prepare the way of *Jehovah*. And “*Jehovah of hosts*” says, “he shall prepare the way before me.” Jesus Christ is therefore *Jehovah*, who was preceded in his visit to mankind by John the Baptist.

(3.) “I will raise unto David a righteous *Branch*, and a *King* shall reign and prosper. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his

* Col. iii. 16. † 1 Tim. i. 12. ‡ Vol. I. p. 287. || Vol. I. p. 285.

§ Vol. I. p. 191. ¶ Isa. xlvi. 8. ** Isa. xl. 3, 5. †† Mal. iii. 4.

name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our righteousness.” *

To the common application of this passage Mr. G. has objected, that in Jer. xxxiii. 14, 16, the same appellation is given to Jerusalem. (See Vol. I, p. 508.) That it is so in our translation, is granted ; and if that be correct, the objection has some strength in it. Whoever compares the two passages, will observe at once the utmost probability that the writer intended them to be parallels. [1.] In both of them, the *Branch of Righteousness*, or the *righteous branch* is the subject. [2.] In both passages, the predicates are *all* the same. This is presumptive evidence that they ought to be parallel *throughout*. When we consider Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16. alone, we observe, [1.] That the Branch is the subject, and therefore the name ought to be predicated of it. [2.] As a *person*, the name is more properly attributed to him, than to a *place*, Jerusalem. [3.] As a *branch of righteousness*, it is natural to suppose that it is *he* who must be called the Lord our *righteousness*. [4.] And lastly, as he “shall execute *judgment and righteousness* in the land” of Israel, and in those days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, it is natural that the inhabitants should regard him as the *author* of righteousness to them, and call him “our righteousness.”

This presumptive evidence, is corroborated by facts :— A few manuscripts have the masculine הַל, *lo*, for הַלָּה, *lah*; and in this way most of the versions have understood it. The Chaldee, the Syriac, and the vulgar Latin read, “This is the name whereby they shall call *him*.” Thus the objection falls to the ground, and *both* passages prove the *Divinity* of the “Branch of Righteousness.”

2. By comparing the following passages, it will further appear that Jesus Christ is Jehovah incarnate.

(1.) “The burden of the word of Jehovah—they shall look upon *me* whom they have *pierced*.” †—This passage is applied to Jesus Christ: “They shall look on *him* whom they have *pierced*.” ‡

(2.) “Thus saith Jehovah that created the heavens, there

* Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.

+ Zec. xii. 1, 10.

‡ John xix. 37.

is no God else beside me ; a just God and a Saviour : there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth ; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, That *unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.*"*—“ We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, *every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.*"†

(3.) “ Thy Maker is thine *husband* ; Jehovah of hosts is his name ; and thy redeemer, the Holy One of Israel.‡—The *bride, the Lamb's wife.*"|| Beside this, according to St. John, when Isaiah saw the glory of Jehovah of hosts he saw the glory of Jesus Christ, and spake of *him*.

(4.) “ Sanctify Jehovah of hosts himself ; and he shall be for a sanctuary ; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel. §—Unto you therefore, which believe, he (Christ) is precious : but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a *stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence.*"¶ Christ therefore is not merely the Jehovah of the Old Testament ; but Jehovah of hosts.

Mr. G. has exhibited a large number of scriptures to prove that the *Son of God is subordinate to God the Father.*"**—With all these we might contrast those passages which we have already examined. But it is not our method to destroy one passage of scripture by another. We attempt, at least, to reconcile them. The passages which Mr. G. has quoted, are intended to shew that *Christ Jesus was man.* Either they prove this, or they do not. If any of them do not prove it, *they do not answer his purpose.* If they do prove it, *we are right in applying them to his human nature.* To all this Mr. G. has consented. “ You agree with us,” says he, “ as far as *we go, only you go much further.* You acknowledge that Jesus Christ possessed a *human nature.* This *we believe.* If then, in addition to this, you also assert that he was a *Deity, the whole of the proof rests with you.*"†† Thus Mr. G. has granted that the proof of his *human na-*

* Isa. xlvi. 18, 21—25. † Rom. xiv. 10, 11. ‡ Isa. liv. 6. || Rev. xxi. 9.
§ Isa. viii. 13, 14. ¶ 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8. ** Vol. I. p. 291. †† Vol. I. p. 327.

ture, is no proof that he is not also *Divine*; and that we acknowledge all he can *positively* assert. But he calls for “*proof*” that Jesus Christ has a nature which is *not human*.* We have already produced it from his own Lectures, (1.) where he has granted that the *Divine perfections* were given to Christ. These were not *human*: (2.) where he has said that “the *Word*” which was made flesh, “*was no other than God himself*:” (3.) where he asserts that St. John wrote his gospel to maintain that the wisdom, and life, and light, attributed to “the word made flesh,” were all *one* and the *same* being, all *God himself*:” (4.) where he says, that, “in Jesus Christ as a man, the *fulness of the Deity* did reside:”† (5.) where he says, that “*God was manifest in the flesh*:”‡ (6.) where he has cited many passages which relate to absolute Deity, some of which relate to *Jesus Christ*: and others of which have their *parallel* passages which relate to *Jesus Christ*. We have produced it also, from the language of both the Old and the New Testament, in which the Divine perfections, nature, and name, are ascribed to Jesus Christ; and on the result we rest the question. Mr. G. and his brethren may affect to overlook these proofs, or pretend they have overturned them: but the candid reader will perceive that they are neither so few, nor so trivial, as our opponents represent them. The state of the controversy then, is simply this: *Jesus Christ* is represented to us as *God* and *Man*. Mr. G. denies the former, because he acknowledges the latter. We acknowledge the former, but by no means deny the latter. The scriptures speak of him as “the *Prince of life*,” who was “*killed*; ||—The *Lord of glory*,” who was *infamously “crucified*; §—the *root of Jesse*, and a *rod out of the stem of Jesse*; ¶—the *Lord*,” and the “*Son*,” the “*root and the offspring of David*;” **—the “*Lord of all*” and the *servant of men*; ††—“the Word, which was *God*, and was made *flesh*; ‡‡ who was in the *form of God*, and was made in the *likeness of men*; ||||—the Son of *God*, and the Son of *man*:—the *fellow of Jehovah*

* Vol. I. p. 356.

† Vol. I. p. 344.

‡ Vol. I. p. 216.

|| Acts iii. 15.

§ 1 Cor. ii. 8.

¶ Isa. xi. 1, 10.

** Matt. xxii. 45.

Rev. xxi. 16.

†† Acts x. 36.

Matt. xx. 28.

‡‡ John i. 1, 14.

||| Phil. ii. 6, 7.

and of *men*; *—*eternal*, and yet *beginning*; †—“having *life in himself*,” ‡ and yet being *dependent*; —“*filling all in all*,” and *lying in a manger*; ||—“*knowing all things*,” and yet *ignorant of some*; §—“*almighty*,” and yet “*crucified through weakness*;” ¶—always “*the same*,” and yet undergoing many *changes*; **—“*reigning for ever*,” and yet *resigning the kingdom*; †† “*equal with God*,” and yet *subordinate*; ‡‡—“*one*” with God, and yet a *Mediator between God and men*. ||||—Such sayings are *apparent contradictions*, and can be reconciled only on the scripture hypothesis which ascribes to him the “*fulness of Godhead*,” and the “*likeness of sinful flesh*.” If the *Socinians* cannot see the *twofold truth*, the *cause of their blindness* is not to be sought in the *ambiguity of revelation*, but in the *pride of reason*, and some fatal *perverseness* of human nature.

* Zech. xiii. 7. Heb. ii. 9. † Mic. v. 2. ‡ John i. 4.

|| Eph. i. 23. § John xxi. 17. ¶ Rev. i. 8. 2 Cor. xiii. 4

** Heb. i. 12. †† Isa. ix. 7. 1 Cor. xv. 24. ‡‡ Phil. ii. 6. &c.
||| John x. 30. 1 Tim. ii. 5.

CHAPTER VI.

*Of the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit.*

WHEN the doctrine of the *Holy Spirit* is considered in its connection with the doctrine of the *Trinity*, there are two points, nearly related to each other, which claim our attention: viz. I. Whether the Holy Spirit be a mere energy, or a real person? II. Whether he be a creature, or God?

I. In entering upon the first of these enquiries, it is necessary to state distinctly, that we are not at present enquiring, whether the Holy Spirit be a *third* person in the God-head. With that question we have here nothing to do. Our object is to ascertain whether the Holy Spirit be, on the one hand, the *mere operation* of God, or, on the other hand, an *intelligent and voluntary agent*. i. e. a *person*.

We are not about to deny that the *Holy Spirit* is that by which, however distinguished, the *Father*, through the *Son*, operates on all created beings, whether material or immaterial. We grant that the power of the Holy Spirit is “the power of the highest—the finger of God;” but not that the Holy Spirit is merely an attribute of the Divine Nature.* That it is something *more*, is what is now to be proved.

Mr. G. has generously conceded that the sacred writers did *personify* the Holy Spirit.† He even says “that it would have been next to an *impossibility* not to have repeat-

* With the utmost propriety, Mr. G. has adopted the words of Simon the Sorcerer for a motto to his Lecture on this subject. The agreement between them is admirable; but it belonged to Mr. G. to be the first to perceive and acknowledge it.

† Vol. I. p. 152.

edly have *personified*" him.* This is a concession which truth has forced from him, when he was attempting to prove the contrary. That the sacred writers did speak of the Holy Spirit as a *person*, is granted by our opponent, and therefore need not be proved. But then, according to Mr. G., *personality* is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, not because he is a *proper person*, but according to a common *rhetorical figure*, by which "other *accidents, qualities or affections*" are personified.† Here then Mr. G. and we are at issue. He avers that the Holy Spirit is only a *figurative person*; we say that he is a *proper person*.

That the unlearned reader may not be deceived by Mr. G.'s flourish about *figures of speech*, it is necessary briefly to state the nature of those which are likely to come under our notice. When a writer attributes to *body* properties which belong *only to spirit*, or attributes to *spirit* properties which belong *only to body*; he then speaks, *not* properly, but *figuratively*. When a writer attributes the properties of a *real being* to mere abstract qualities, and speaks of those qualities as *persons*; while they have *no real personality*: then also he speaks, *not* properly, but *figuratively*. But when a writer attributes to *body*, only the *properties of body*; and to *spirit*, only the *properties of spirit*; and when he speaks of *qualities*, *not* as of *real beings*, but as of *qualities*, and of *real beings*, as of *real beings*—then he speaks, *not figuratively, but properly*.

The supposition that the Holy Spirit is, by the sacred writers, *improperly personified*, if it have any foundation in truth, must be grounded on the *impossibility* of his *being a proper person*, or of his *possessing any personal qualities*. If mere abstract *wisdom, power, or goodness* be personified, we see immediately that the writer is speaking *figuratively*; because these attributes have no real existence but in the *spirits* in which they inhere. But when we find a *spirit* personified,—that very kind of *real being* in which *alone* those personal qualities can inhere, we are sure that the words of the writer are *not figurative*, but that they are used with the utmost *propriety*. Now such by *name*, as well as by *nature*,

* Vol. I. p. 173.

† Vol. I. p. 152.

is the Holy SPIRIT : who, therefore, of all other beings, is most *properly* spoken of as a *person*.

To puzzle the reader, after the *Socinian* manner, Mr. G. has told him that “the primary signification of *πνευμα*, which is commonly translated *spirit*, is the breath of the mouth.”* The reader must be told also, that it is the only word which the sacred writers of the New Testament use, and, in fact, the only term which the language afforded them, by which to convey the idea of *immaterial substance*. *Η νευμα ου πνευμα και ουτε ρους εχει*: “A *Spirit* hath not flesh and bones.”† But does Mr. G. mean to insinuate that *breath* is its *proper* signification when it is applied to the Deity? Rather than relinquish a favourite error, while he is perpetually declaiming against the *literal* interpretation of scriptural *figures*, will he be guilty of a most gross and palpable *absurdity*, that of *literally* applying to God, who is a *Spirit*, one of the meanest properties of an animal body? Has God a *mouth*? And does he actually *breathe* from it? God is, *πνευμα*, a *Spirit*. Is God then a *breath*? Must not breath, if attributed to God, be attributed to him figuratively? And if figuratively, what is the meaning of the word? Can it be any thing *corporeal*? Or, is it not rather properly translated *spirit*? What then is the *Holy Spirit*, but a *Spirit*? Is not God properly a *Spirit*? What then is the *Spirit* of God, but a *Spirit*? If the *Holy Spirit* be neither a *Spirit*, nor *matter*, it is *nothing*. If the *Spirit* of God be not a *Spirit*, there is no *spirit* in the universe.

But if the *Spirit* of God be a *Spirit*, what is the reason to be assigned for the supposition that *personality* is *figuratively* ascribed to him? What can be *properly* a person, if a *spirit* be not? This is not the way, however, in which the Socinians reason. They have adopted an idea of the nature of spirit, altogether different from that which is suggested by the scriptures. Mr. G. says, “from this very name (Spirit) I should draw precisely the *opposite* inference, that because it is a spirit, it is *not* a *substance or person*.”* If, in this confession, he have not evinced much *understanding*, he has given a strong proof of his *candour*. It is at

* Vol. I. p. 150.

† Luke xxiv. 39.

‡ Vol. I. p. 125.

least an *honest* confession, and may serve as a *beacon* to “*warn off*” the unwary reader from the rocks of Atheism. Mr. G. acknowledges that “God is a *Spirit*.” This is a branch of his *natural* religion. “But “because it (*he*) is a Spirit, it (*he*) is *not* a *substance* or *person*.” Now, to say nothing of the *crudities* of Mr. G.’s philosophical notions of spirit, Who could demonstrate more effectually than he has done, that Socinianism, Deism, and Atheism, are nearly allied? God either is a person, or he is not. If he be *not* a person, he is not an *intelligent* and *voluntary* agent: that is, *there is no God*. If he be a person, and spirit have no personality, no intellect or will, then God is *not* Spirit but Matter. As the essential property of matter is extension, and extension necessarily implies *limits*, *matter* cannot be *infinite*. A *material* God *cannot* be an *infinite* God: and a *finite* God is *no God at all*. Again: All attributes or accidents must have a *substance* in which to inhere. If “God is a Spirit,” and Spirit is not a *substance*, then God is not a substance. If God be not a substance, he can have no accidents or attributes. God, therefore, is neither substance nor accident, he has neither being nor attributes, i. e. he is nothing.—If the “unskilful” will not take the alarm when Mr. G.’s trumpet gives no “uncertain sound,” their case is hopeless. We appeal from the speculative Atheism of Mr. G. to the better understanding of plain, unlettered men, who read their bibles. Let the absurdity, not to say blasphemy, into which his “precisely *opposite* inference” would lead us, serve as the best argument that could be produced, to convince us, that a *spirit* is a *substance*, and a *person*.

So far is it from being true that the Spirit of God is a mere attribute of spirit, that the proper *attributes* of spirit are ascribed to him! *Goodness* is an attribute of spirit, and is ascribed to him. “Thou art my God, thy *Spirit* is *good*.”* Hence that *holiness* which belongs only to intelligent and voluntary agents is made peculiarly characteristic of him, and is not so often attributed to *any other* being: He is called emphatically the *HOLY SPIRIT*. Mr. G. supposes the Spirit of God to be the *mere power* of God. But *power* and

* Psalm. cxliii. 10.

energy are attributed to *the Spirit of God*. St Paul speaks of “*the power of the Spirit of God*.”* Now either the Apostle means to speak of the *power* of a *power*, the *attribute* of an *attribute*, which is an absurdity; or he must mean to attribute these *personal* qualities to the Spirit as to a *spirit*, a *substance*, and a real *person*.

To pursue this subject further.—If the Holy Spirit be a *spirit*, how can it be a mere energy which has no *personality*? Our ideas of a person are those of an *intelligent* and *voluntary* agent; and such are the ideas which the scriptures give us of the Spirit of God.

1. He is an *intelligent* agent. “The things which God hath prepared for them that love him, (says St. Paul) he hath revealed unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit *searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God*. For what man *knoweth* the things of a man, save the *spirit* of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.”† Here we have a plain and unequivocal declaration that “*the Spirit of God searcheth and knoweth all things, even the deep things of God*.” How then will Mr. G. get over it? Nothing is more easy. He will raise a dust, and escape in the cloud. Let us hear him, and examine his comment at full length.—“Here are,” says he, “the following *positive assertions*,—that the knowledge they (the Apostles) possessed, was revealed to them by *the Spirit of God himself*, (query, *himself!*) or by divine inspiration.”—Very true!—“that there was *nothing too great* to be thus made known to them; even the *deep counsels* of the Almighty.”—Not so. This “assertion” is not St. Paul’s, but Mr. G.’s. St. Paul asserts that “*the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God*:” and Mr. G., to get rid of this *troublesome* “assertion,” substitutes one of his own, which is not true. *Infinite* things are “*too great*” to be made fully known to *finite* minds. “The love of Christ,” with the good leave of the *Socinians*, “*passeth knowledge*:” even the knowledge of those who “are strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man.”‡—“And then,” Mr. G. adds, as if for fear he should not be understood, “the

* Rom. xv. 19.

† 1 Cor. ii. 9—11

‡ Eph. iii. 10, 19.

Apostle explains what he meant by the *Spirit of God*, by saying, *it was exactly the same in God, as the spirit of a man is in a human being.*" That is, if Mr. G. please, as there is an *intelligent* spirit in man, which *knows* the things of a man; so the Spirit of God is an *intelligent* Spirit, which *knoweth* the things of God. Q. E. D.—Thus has Mr. G. led us, undesignedly and unexpectedly, to the very conclusion which we wished. *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*

2. The Holy Spirit is a *voluntary* agent: he has a *will*. "It seemed good, to the *Holy Ghost*," say the Apostles, "and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things," * &c.—Again: "He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the *mind* of the *Spirit*, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to (the will of) God" †—But Mr. G. is disposed to controvert the meaning of this last passage, and to deny that it is of the *Spirit of God* the Apostle is speaking. We will examine his paraphrase. "Our spiritual desires," says he, "come in aid of our bodily weakness."—So our "not *knowing* what we should pray for as we ought," is a bodily weakness, and not a mental "infirmity." All the absurdity of this comment is only that of substituting *body* for *spirit*: an easy thing with one who knows no difference! We proceed:—"For we know not what we should pray for as we ought, but our inward spiritual desires intercede for us, though we cannot express them in appropriate language."—So, after all, this "*bodily weakness*" is only the want of grammatical knowledge! Our poor weak bodies are not masters-of Rhetoric: we *cannot express ourselves properly*! Nay, that is not the entire sum of our bodily weakness: Our bodies "*know not* what we should pray for as we ought." They are ignorant bodies! Hence "our *inward spiritual* desires intercede for us." Our spirit takes pity on the weakness of our body, and since the latter cannot *know, desire, and ask*, as the Socinians think it ought, the former undertakes its cause, and performs these necessary duties much to the advantage of its dull companion. And then, says Mr. G., "He, that searcheth the heart, knoweth the desires of our spirit, that, agreeably to the will

* Acts xv. 24. † Rom. viii. 27.

of God, *it* pleadeth in behalf of the *holy*.*—That is, *We* do not know what we ought to ask, but our *spirit*, which though it was but this moment our very selves, is now another thing, knows all about it, hits upon “the will of God” exactly, and by its “*desires*,” the only language it can, on such an occasion, use, pleads successfully the cause of the *holy*: that is, of our *holy body*!

The palpable contradictions, and gross absurdities of this comment, sufficiently separate it from the text. This is another glaring instance of the arbitrary and *irrational* manner in which Socinians explain the scriptures. If, after this strong opiate, we can recover the use of our reason, let us examine the text itself.

“We know not what we should pray for as we ought.”—It is but just now we have seen, that the *spirit* of man, is that *in man* which knoweth the things of a man. But this *spirit in man*, *knoweth not, of itself*; what we ought to pray for. If it knew independently what to pray for *as we ought*, its own unaided desires would be according to the will of God. This ignorance is, therefore, our infirmity. But “the *Spirit helpeth our infirmities*.” If the Spirit helpeth our infirmities, and our infirmities are those of ignorance, which is an infirmity of our spirit; it cannot be *our own* spirit that helpeth itself. The Apostle’s words are not $\pi\tau\pi\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha \eta\mu\omega$, *our spirit*, but $\tau\sigma\pi\tau\pi\epsilon\nu\mu\alpha$, *the Spirit*. The question then is, *What* spirit is that by which we are thus assisted? (1.) We know of no Spirit by which we can be thus “helped,” but the Spirit of him “that searcheth the hearts,” who alone can perfectly know what we *want*, and what we may *have*, and who can “make intercession for the saints according to the will of God.” (2.) To suppose any other spirit which maketh intercession for the saints, is to vindicate the idolatries against which we have all *protested*. (3.) The Apostle is speaking of those “who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, (viz. of the Spirit of God) and who *groan* within themselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their body.” (4.) This is what the Apostles teach as being at once the privilege and

* Vol. I. p. 122.

the duty of all Christians—"praying in the *Holy Ghost.*"*

St. Paul, speaking of the "diversity of spiritual gifts," says, "all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will."† To evade the force of this clear and positive declaration, Mr. G. compares it with the following passage: "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of *sin unto death*, or of obedience unto righteousness?"—“Here,” says he, “*sin* is a person,” and the personal pronoun *whom* applied to it. And not only has it *will*, but also keeps servants and pays *wages.*‡—Who does not see, that, at this rate, the proper personality of God and man may easily be disproved? *Sin*, we know, is only an abstract quality. When, therefore, it is *personified*, we know that a *figure* is used, because properties and actions are ascribed to it, which do not belong to it. To prove, that volition is *improperly* ascribed to the Spirit of God on the same ground, it is therefore necessary first to prove, that the Holy Spirit *also* is a mere abstract quality, and that there is a glaring absurdity in ascribing to it volition. But this Mr. G. has not even attempted to prove. And no wonder: for to attempt to prove that volition is *improperly* attributed to a Spirit, is equivalent to an attempt to prove that volition is improperly attributed to man, to angels, and to God.

To what has been advanced in proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, it is unnecessary to subjoin those proofs, the validity of which must depend on that of those which precede. The scriptures attribute to the Holy Spirit the personal affections of *grief* and *vexation*;—the personal faculties of *hearing* and *speech*,—and the personal offices of a *teacher*, a *guide*, a *monitor*, a *witness*, an *ambassador*, and a *comforter*. In attempting to set aside these scriptural proofs of the doctrine in question, Mr. G. on one occasion shews that similar affections are attributed to other beings, which are really *persons*; and thus, while he denies that those affections prove that *distinct* personality which we have not

* Jude 20.

† 1 Cor. xii. 11.

‡ Vol. I. p. 130.

yet examined, he grants *that* personality for which we now contend. * Thus, of one class of those proofs, he has left us the entire possession.—To the rest he answers, by shewing that the personal *faculties* and *offices* of which we speak, are often attributed to other beings, and even to things inanimate. † His argument is not drawn out at length, lest it should break. The drift of it we suppose to be this : The personal faculties and offices are by a figure attributed to beings which manifestly have no personality, and therefore they are *figuratively* attributed to the Spirit of God. But here, again, his proof is at once confused and defective. *Sense* and *speech* are *properly* ascribed only to *animated bodies*. To *inanimate* bodies, or to *incorporeal* spirits, they can only be ascribed by a *figure*. Again : To *inanimate* matter, or *irrational* animals, because of their want of *reason* which is necessary to the *proper* performance of the functions of a moral teacher, a spiritual guide, &c.,—those offices can only be ascribed *figuratively*. But to spirits, which are naturally endowed with intellect and volition, whether those spirits be corporeal, or incorporeal, such functions are ascribed with the utmost propriety ; because they, and only they, are capable of the performance of them. Mr. G. cannot therefore fairly take from us the proofs arising from hence, without proving that the Holy Spirit is not a Spirit, and that he is incapable of understanding and will. Nor can we, on the other hand, support those proofs against his objections, without a reference to the *spirituality* of the Spirit of God, and to that spirit's understanding and will. On the latter, therefore, the personality of the Holy Spirit does and must depend. But when that spirituality is once proved, our possession of all the proofs arising from the personal offices ascribed by the sacred writers to the Holy Spirit, is confirmed.

It is now time to pay some attention to the objections which Mr. G. has raised to this doctrine.

1. “The *neuter pronoun*, *it*, is in *no other instance* in the Scriptures, *ever applied* to a person.”

Gender is only properly attributed to *animal bodies* ; but God is of *no* gender, and therefore the sacred writers were

* Vol. I. p. 130.

† Vol. I. pp. 127, 128, 131.

left at liberty to speak grammatically, and to put their articles and pronouns in the same gender with the nouns with which they should agree. To *Σειρ*, the word used in Acts xvii. 29. and translated, *the Godhead*, is *neuter*, and has a *neuter* article. The word *πνευμα* is of the *neuter* gender, and therefore requires that the article which is prefixed to it, and the pronoun to which it is the antecedent, should be put in the *neuter* gender. Had the Evangelists and Apostles written in *Latin*, they would have used the *masculine* noun, *spiritus*, and, according to the above rule of grammar, their pronouns had then been put in the *masculine* gender. But when a word is used which is *not* of the *neuter* gender, the *masculine* article, and the *masculine* pronoun, are used with it. O *παρακλητος*, “*he the comforter*,” is in the *masculine* gender. In this case, therefore, our Lord uses the *masculine* pronoun:—“If I go, I will send *αυτον* *HIM*;—“and when *εκεινος* *he* is come.”* But this is not all. Even when the noun *πνευμα* is used, and the construction of the sentence is such that the rules of grammar do require the pronoun to be put in the *neuter* gender, it is put in the *masculine*. Thus: “But when *εκεινος* *he*, *το πνευμα* the Spirit, is come.”† Again: *εκεινος* “*he* shall glorify me.”‡ Here again, Mr. G. has led us to a strong argument in favour of the personality of the Holy Spirit: for what reason can be assigned for the use of *masculine pronouns*, which have a *neuter antecedent*, or precede a *neuter noun*, but the *proper* personality of the Spirit? When, on the other hand, Jesus Christ, who is unquestionably a person, is spoken of, either the *masculine* or the *neuter* article is used, as the noun may require. O δε *Kυριος το Πνευμα*. says St. Paul: “The Lord is the Spirit.” Here, that the articles may each agree with the noun to which it is prefixed, both the *masculine* and the *neuter* article are used. If what Mr. G. says be true, he will now “*start with astonishment*” to find that both the *Lord*, and the *Spirit*, are at once *masculine* and *neuter*: and that, according to his mode of reasoning, they both are at once *persons*, and “*things without life or sense?*”

* John xvi. 7, 8.

† v. 13.

‡ v. 14.

2. "Notwithstanding the *promises* of our Saviour to send a Comforter, and the personal offices he ascribed to it, no such *person* ever appeared to the Apostles,—nor do they appear to have expected it."*

Mr. G.'s head is running on a *corporeal* appearance, rather than on a purely *spiritual* being. That no *such* appearance was expected or seen by the Apostles, is granted. Mr. G. says, he has heard of the Apostles "receiving the Holy Spirit," but it appears that, with him, an *animated body* is necessary to constitute a *person*. Such are the distinctions, and such the arguments, on which Socinianism is founded!

3. "In the Epistles of the New Testament," Mr. G. says, "there are, at the beginning and elsewhere, wishes of *peace* from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, but none from the Spirit *distinctly*."[†]

The reader will learn from the drift of this argument that if the sacred writers had wished *peace* "from the Spirit *distinctly*," Mr. G. would grant, not only that the Holy Spirit is a person, but that he is a *third* person in the Divine nature. Now let us try whether his heart will bow to the word of truth. "*John* to the seven churches in *Asia*: *Grace* be unto you, and *peace*, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven *Spirits* which are before his throne, viz. the seven Spirits of God, (chap. iii. 1.)[‡] and from Jesus Christ." || Mr. G. must now be converted.

4. "St. Paul wishes to the Corinthians the *communion*, *fellowship*, or *participation* of the Holy Spirit, which can with no propriety be spoken of a person."[§]

So Mr. G. may suppose, when he first formed the most confused ideas of the Spirit of God, and has imagined, as we have just seen, that a body is necessary to constitute a person. But let us for a moment consider the subject. In his second epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle wishes *ποιησαντας του αγίου τενευμάτως*, "the fellowship of the Holy Spirit to be with all of them." Now, very providentially, the

* Vol. I. pp. 155, 156. † Vol. I. p. 156.

‡ The number *seven* is used in the Apocalypse as a number indicating perfection. || Rev. i. 11. § Vol. I. p. 157.

same Apostle, addressing his first epistle to the same church, says also, “ God is faithful, by whom ye are called εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ νεού ζωτοῦ, to the fellowship *of* his Son.”* St. Peter says, “ you might be θεῖς κοινωνοὶ φυσεῶς, partakers of the divine nature.”† And one more: “ We are made μετοχοὶ τῆς Χριστοῦ partakers of Christ.”‡ Mr. G. must have formed some erroneous idea of the subject; for the Father and the Son are undoubtedly persons, and it appears from St. Peter, and St. Paul, that we *may* have the same communion, fellowship, or participation of the Divine nature, and of Christ. Let him therefore translate the words as he pleases, he cannot consistently object to the personality of the *Holy Spirit*, without objecting also to the personality of “ the Divine nature” and of Jesus Christ.

5. Mr. G. has found, in the scriptures, certain expressions applied to the Father and the Son, which are not, *in his opinion*, used concerning the Holy Spirit. From hence he infers, that personality cannot be attributed to the latter as to the former. His *Argument* may be set aside by observing, that if there be any distinction between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, some things may well be attributed to one and *not* to another of them. The supposed *fact* on which his argument is founded, may be set aside by comparing other passages of scripture with those which Mr. G. has quoted. For instance: With respect to the Father and the Son, Mr. G. quotes the following: “ Now God himself, even our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, *direct our way* unto you.||—Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God even our Father, who hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting *consolation* and good *hope*, through grace, *comfort* your hearts, and *stablish* you in every good work.§—Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ, by the *commandment* of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ.”¶—On the other hand, the sacred writers use *similar*, though not the *same* expressions concerning the *Holy Spirit*. For instance: “ He shall *lead* you into all truth.—Jesus was *led* by the Spirit into the wilderness.**

* 1 Cor. i. 9. † 2 Pet. i. 4. ‡ Heb. iii. 14. || 1 Thess. iii. 11.
§ 2 Thess. ii. 16. ¶ 1 Tim. i. 1. ** Matt. iv. 1.

—Then the Spirit said unto Philip, go near and join thyself to this chariot.*—They essayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them not.†—The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost.‡—And walking in the fear of God, and in the comfort, (or consolation) of the Holy Ghost.”||—That ye may abound in hope by the power of the Holy Ghost.§—To be strengthened with might by his Spirit.¶ The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.”**—Thus, we find that what Mr. G. thinks to be ascribed exclusively to the Father and the Son, is equally ascribed to the Holy Spirit.

6. “ If the Holy Spirit be a distinct person in the God-head, then he was the parent of Jesus Christ.††

To this we answer: It was not the *divine*, but the *human* nature of Jesus Christ which was conceived of the virgin; and, for obvious reasons, it is enough to say, that *that* was not produced by the Holy Spirit as a *Father*, but *without* a Father. It was a creation. All the absurdities, therefore, which Mr. G. has imagined to follow, fall to the ground.—It appears however, that the accounts which St. Luke and St. Matthew give of the miraculous conception, when they can be converted into a battery against the doctrine of the Trinity, are not spurious! When the miraculous conception is to be disproved, the Socinians cannot allow them to be genuine.

7. Mr. G.’s argument in page 165, is not levelled against the doctrine of this Chapter. His objections, numbered 5, 6, 7 and 8, may be put together as specimens of the depth of his metaphysical reasonings.—“ The Holy Spirit is said to be given by measure; to be poured out; the disciples are said to be filled and baptized with it; it is said to be quenched; and in several instances it is said to be divided. How do these sayings agree with the idea of his personality?” ††

This is a literary curiosity! How is it that Mr. G., who is perpetually dreaming about *metaphors*, can see none

* Acts viii. 29.

† Acts xvi. 7.

‡ John xiv. 26.

|| Acts ix. 31.

§ Rom. xv. 13.

¶ Eph. iii. 16.

** Acts, xiii. 2.

†† Vol. I. p. 160.

†† Vol. I. pp. 166. 168.

here? And why, when he was determined to interpret all these scriptural expressions *literally*, did he not seize the long-sought opportunity to prove that the Spirit is *not spirit*, but *matter*? What but *matter*, which is an extended substance, can be *measured*, *divided*, *poured out*? What but *fire* which is *matter*, can be *extinguished*? And wherewith can any man (except a Socinian, see p. 37.) be *washed*, but with *water*, which is another species of *matter*? And lastly, what is spirit but *breath* or *wind*, that is *air*, which is also *material*? Thus the demonstration is complete, and the favourite system of materialism is triumphant. But a man who is *compos mentis*, will at once see that all these are figurative expressions, by which the properties of *matter* are predicated of *spirit*; and therefore, that every argument founded upon the *literal* interpretation of them must fall to the ground. Unless Mr. G. seriously intend to deny all spirituality to the Spirit, he will find that his objection is levelled against his own, as much as at the common, hypothesis. He thinks it “*perfectly rational* to suppose, that *divine powers* were *divided*, *measured*, and *poured out*, or that persons were *baptized* with them, or *quenched* them.” Now let Mr. G. be asked, What is the *cubic measure* of the divine *power*? Into how many parts is it *divisible*? What *quantity* of it will fill a man of ordinary stature? After a *division* of it into many *parts*, do those parts *attract* each other again, or does *division annihilate* some of them? How is it used, when Socinians *baptize* with it, instead of ordinary *water*? What becomes of it when it is *quenched*?—“Oh,” says Mr. G., “these are all *figurative expressions*.” The answer is satisfactory. But it is equally so, as a reply to his objections to the personality of the Holy Spirit.

8. Mr. G.’s next objection is founded on the *supposed ignorance* of the *Holy Spirit*. Because our Lord has said, “*No one knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any one the Father save the Son*,” Mr. G. infers, that the Holy Spirit knew neither the Father nor the Son, without a special revelation. From hence he argues, that “the

Holy Spirit cannot possibly be a person in the Godhead distinct from the Father.”*

This argument is founded on a gross mistake. For, as we have already seen, “the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.” What is here said of the Father and the Son, is therefore asserted also of the Holy Ghost. “No one, *ωδεις*, knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God, and he to whom the Spirit of God, shall reveal them.” Will Mr. G. now draw the same inference concerning the Father and the Son?

9. Lastly: “The expressions of the Holy Spirit being *given* by the Father, and *sent* by Jesus Christ, are incompatible with the idea of its being a person.”†

What an argument! So the *Son of God* was not a *person*, because, forsooth, “God so loved the world that he *gave* his only begotten Son;”‡ and because the Father “*sent* him into the world.” But Mr. G. has an answer ready. We are informed that Jesus Christ “came voluntarily.” So then the Son of God was a *person*, had a *will*, before he came into the world, and came voluntarily! Thus does a Socinian establish, at one time, what at another he pulls down. But if it had not been expressly said, that Jesus Christ came voluntarily into the world, Mr. G. would have denied him the honour of *personality*. And yet every *person* of us came into the world *involuntarily*.

II. Having found the Holy Spirit to be, not a mere energy, an abstract attribute, but a *substance*, a *real* being, and a *person*, we now enquire whether he be a *creature* or God.

If the Holy Spirit be, as we have shewn, a *Spirit*, he must be either *created* or *uncreated*. It is not consistent with Mr. G.’s hypothesis to assert that he is created; nor could such an assertion find any support from the authority of scripture. But if he be *not* a creature, and yet be a *real* being, he must be God.

The Holy Spirit is frequently denominated the *Spirit of God*. If then, as our Lord has asserted,

* Vol. I. p. 169.

† Vol. I. p. 165.

‡ John iii. 16.

and Mr. G. has repeatedly granted, “*God be a Spirit,*” the *Spirit of God* is God. There is no way of evading this conclusion but by supposing that God is one Spirit which is himself, and *has* another which is the Spirit of God. But by this supposition we run into two absurdities: viz. First that there are *two Divine SPIRITS*, and therefore *two GODS*; and, Secondly, that these *two Spirits* are *one Spirit*, and these *two Gods, one God.*

Doctor Lardner, whom Mr. G. has thought proper to cite, “thinks that in many places the *Spirit*, or the *Spirit of God*, or the *Holy Ghost*, is equivalent to *God himself:*”* Whether Mr. G. agrees with the Doctor or not, it is difficult to judge; for, in the present instance, the question cannot be decided by the *contradiction* which that agreement would involve. Be that as it may, we shall find that he cannot fairly interpret many parts of scripture without implicitly sliding into the Doctor’s position.

When, therefore, Mr. G. finds himself hemmed in by such scriptures as denominate the Holy Ghost the *Spirit of God*, he is obliged to grant, that “by the *Spirit of God* is meant the same thing, in reference to God, as the spirit of man in relation to man.”†—Now, I think, for consistency’s sake, (says he,) you must allow, that if, by the *Spirit of God* is meant a *distinct being*, by the *spirit of man*, must also be meant a *being distinct* from the man.‡—Only, (he adds,) do not say that, in one instance the words must be figurative, and in another they must be literal, just as best suits the system you have adopted. [Saul among the prophets!] Upon fair reasoning then on scripture grounds, if your arguments prove the *Spirit of God* to be a *being distinct* from God, from precisely similar premises we may draw the following inferences, that the *Spirit of Jesus* was a *being distinct* from Jesus; the *spirit of Paul*, a *being distinct* from Paul; and the *spirit of every man* *distinct* from the *man himself.*||

“How forcible are right words!” Who could have argued more conclusively, that the *Spirit of God* is *God*, than, in these few lines, Mr. G. has done? We believe that

* Vol. I. p. 152. † Vol. I. p. 162. ‡ Vol. I. p. 122. || Vol. I. p. 123.

the *spirit* of man, though distinct from the *body* of man, is *man*, and not a *being distinct* from man. With Dr. Lardner, and Mr. G. who quotes (query, *believes?*) him, we say that it is “the *incorruptible part of* man, which survives after (the) death (of the body.)” And we join with them in their judicious appeal to Solomon, who says, “And the *spirit* shall return to God who gave it.”* God, however, has no body, but is all incorruptible spirit. We are, therefore, violently driven, by Mr. G.’s most conclusive argumentation, to confess, that “the *Spirit of God* is not a *being distinct from God*, but *God himself*.”

We may now, without fear of contradiction, and in hope of further occasional assistance from Mr. G., proceed to adduce some additional proofs of what he has so liberally granted.

1. The *Spirit of God* is frequently called *God*. Not that the sacred writers formally announce the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, as, when they say “the Word was *God*,” they announce the Divinity of the Son. In the latter case, the truth was, and must be, unknown, until it were revealed. But in the former case, treating the subject as already known where the Holy Spirit was understood to be the *Spirit of God*, and supposing his proper divinity to be as obvious to all men, as it is to Mr. G., they only mention it incidentally and, as it were, without design. This method, however, rather strengthens than weakens their testimony. In this way, St. Peter, having charged Ananias with “lying to the *Holy Ghost*,” immediately subjoins, “Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto *God*.”† “So that,” to use the words of Athanasius, approved by Dr. Lardner, and cited by Mr. G. in *confirmation* of his own argument, “he who lied to the Holy Spirit, lied unto *God*, who dwells in men by his *Spirit*.”‡ St. Paul speaks in the same manner; for having made that appeal to the Corinthians, “What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the *Holy Ghost* which is *in you*, which ye have of *God*?¶ he, in another place, tells them, “Ye are the *temple* of the living *God*; as *God* hath said, I will *dwell in them*, and *walk in them*.”§ To the

* Eccles. xii. 7. † Acts v. 3, 4. ‡ Vol. 1. p. 162. ¶ 1 Cor. vi. 19. § 2 Cor. vi. 16.

Ephesians, the same Apostle writes, “ You are builded together, for an *habitation of God* through the *Spirit*.” * — And lastly : St. John says, “ He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the *Spirit* which he hath given us.” †

2. As the *name* of God is thus applied to the Holy Spirit, the argument adduced from thence is much confirmed by the application to him, which we find the sacred writers make, of those *perfections* which are *exclusively Divine*.

(1.) He is represented as *eternal*.—“ Christ through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God.” ‡

(2.) He is represented as *omnipresent*. “ Whither shall I go from thy SPIRIT? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the *uttermost parts of the sea*; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me.” || In this passage the Psalmist speaks of the presence, and of the *Spirit*, of God, as synonymous, and attributes to the *Spirit of God* the proper *omnipresence of God*.

(3.) He is represented as *omniscient*. “ Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or, being his counsellor, hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding?” §—It is remarkable that in this passage, compared with the context, the prophet speaks indifferently of *Jehovah*, and of the *Spirit of Jehovah*;—and that the Apostle Paul applies it to God himself, when, speaking of the infinite knowledge of the wisdom of God, he exclaims, “ O the depth of the riches both of the *wisdom* and *knowledge* of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the

* Eph. ii. 22.

† 1 John iii. 24.

‡ Heb. ix. 14.

|| Psalm cxxxix. 7—10.

§ Isa. xl. 13, 14.

Lord? or who hath been his *counsellor?*"*—The drift of the passage is, to assert that peculiar attribute of the Holy Spirit, — *original, undriven knowledge*. Of the *extent* of that knowledge we have already seen the strongest testimony in those words: “The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.—The things of God knoweth *ωδεις*, no one, but the *Spirit of God*.”†

(4.) He is represented as *omnipotent*. In the passage just cited, without changing the person, the prophet proceeds, “Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing.”‡ “All these worketh that one and the self-same *Spirit*.” Should it be asked, What are *all* these? the answer is, “Wisdom,—knowledge,—faith,—gifts of healing,—working of miracles, prophecy,—discerning of spirits,—divers kinds of tongues,” and “the interpretation of tongues:”||—gifts which imply *omniscience, prescience, and omnipotence*, in the donor. So the angel declared to Mary the Mother of Jesus: “The *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the *power* of the *Highest* shall overshadow thee:”§ thus declaring the power of the Holy Spirit to be the power of the Highest.

(5.) He is represented as *supreme*. The gifts just now mentioned, the donation of which requires the exertion of *prescience, omniscience, and omnipotence*, are said to be by the *Spirit*, “divided to every man severally *as he will*.”¶ Even Mr. G. acknowledges his *supremacy*: “That its (the Holy Spirit’s) commands are to be obeyed, *we know*, because *they are the commands of God*.”**

3. The word of God is said to be the word of the *Holy Spirit*. “God,” says the writer to the Hebrews, “at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the *prophets*.†† They said, “Thus saith Jehovah. ††—All scripture is given by inspiration of God.”||| On the other hand, “No propheey of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy

* Rom. xi. 33, 34.

† 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.

‡ Isa. xl. 15.

|| 1 Cor. xii. 8—11.

§ Luke. i. 35.

¶ 1 Cor. xi. 11.

** Vol. I. p. 131.

†† Heb. i. 1.

||| Isa. xlvi. 5.

||| 2 Tim. iii. 16.

came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the **HOLY GHOST**.* “For David himself said by the **HOLY GHOST**,† &c. “The **HOLY GHOST** also is a witness unto us: for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them,”‡ &c.—It would be easy to multiply passages to the same purpose. But these are enow. It is an important observation, that, in the latter passage, the **Holy Ghost** is represented as the **God** who had *made a covenant* with Israel. Let the reader compare with it the following: “Behold the days come, saith JEHOVAH, when **I** will make a new covenant with the house of Israel,”|| &c.

4. The *works* of **God** are ascribed to the *Spirit of God*. “He that *built all things* is **God**.”§—“Thus saith JEHOVAH, thy Redeemer, and he that *formed* thee from the womb, I am Jehovah that *maketh all things*; that *stretcheth forth* the heavens *alone*; that *spreadeth abroad* the earth *by myself*.”¶ Yet these works, which JEHOVAH hath wrought *alone*, and *by himself*, were wrought by the *Spirit of God*. “The *Spirit of God* moved upon the face of the waters.”** “By his *Spirit* he hath *garnished* the *heavens*.”††

Such are the testimonies of the sacred writers to the proper Divinity of the **Holy Spirit**. If any addition to them be wanting, it is the testimony of Mr. G., whose arguments will clear up whatever remains of difficulty, *thus*:

“Omnipresence is *exclusively* a divine attribute. Yet I appeal to you to say, what are the representations you have commonly received from Christ and his Apostles concerning the *Holy Spirit*? “Are they not, that he is *every where*, at *all times present* with you? *What is this but the divine attribute of omnipresence?*”

“Is he not also represented to you as *omniscient*? Does he not dive into your most *secret thoughts*? Has he not access to your *hearts*? Does he not *suggest* to you motives of action? *What is this but the divine attribute of omniscience?*”

* 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. † Mark xii. 36.

§ Heb. iii. 4.

‡ Heb. x. 15.

** Gen. i. 2.

|| Heb. viii. 8.

†† Job xxvi. 13.

“ Does he not possess the power of changing the laws of nature, by the *operation of a miracle?* Has he not also the power of *prescience?* This being is represented as *foreknowing* the counsels of God.

“ These attributes are all *divine.* And if there actually be a being possessing these attributes, that being *ought to be a deity.* If he be a deity, *he ought to be worshipped.”* *

Thanks to Mr. G. for thus saving us the trouble of proving that divine worship ought to be rendered to the Holy Spirit. “ *He which persecuted us in times past, now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed!*”

* Vol. I. pp. 19, 20.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the Scriptural Doctrine of the Trinity.

To a being like man, who knows nothing of the essence of any of the *creatures* of God, it is absolutely impossible to entertain precise and adequate ideas of the Most High. God has therefore been pleased to make himself known to us by *Analogy*. This method is to be distinguished from that which the Socinians call *metaphorical*. Metaphor in their hands is a mere figure of rhetoric : a form of speech in which, for the sake of either beauty or force, any quality not proper to the subject is attributed to it, and in the explication of which, that the subject may be viewed in its own light, the *borrowed* idea is to be exchanged for the *proper* one which it represents. In this case the subject is supposed, when stript of its ornament, to be well understood. It is only an artificial method of dressing up an idea of which we have already some conception.—The *analogical* method of teaching is very different. It is founded in a certain *resemblance in circumstances*, between two things, which are, in their *nature*, different. That resemblance is supposed to be distinctly perceived by the teacher, though not by the learner. In this case, ideas are borrowed from such things as are *known* to the learner, and applied to the thing *unknown* to him ; and these *borrowed ideas*, which are sufficiently plain and intelligible, are made to stand for the *precise idea*, which the learner is *incapable* of entertaining. To receive instruction in this manner, the *figure* is not to be *withdrawn*, that the subject may be understood ; for the subject can be understood only by *retaining* it. The idea thus communicated, is not, however, to be entertained as the precise idea (i. e. the altogether proper and perfect picture) of the thing in question, (for it is “*a shadow*, and *not* the

very image of the thing ;") but as the *best* idea of it of which we are *capable*.

It is by this analogical method God has been pleased to make to mankind the brightest discoveries of himself. "We know only in *part*.—We see, δι' εσωτρού εν ανυματι, through a mirror in an *enigma*."* For instance :

"God is *light*." The idea suggested by this assertion is, that there is a certain analogy between *God*, and *light*. What light is to the *natural* world, God is to the *spiritual*. But light is *matter*, and is divisible, and movable. Is God then divisible and movable *matter*? No; God is *spiritual* light. But what consistency is there between *spirituality* and *matter*? None at all. The idea is "not the very image ;" it is but, as it were, "a shadow" of God. But we must not lay it aside, for it is one of the best we can have. We speak as the oracles of God, when we say, "God is light," though the idea is not strictly compatible with the *spirituality* which we attribute to him. The spirituality of God is not, however, contradictory to his *real* nature, but to our *imperfect* idea of him. If our idea of him were perfect, there would not be even the *appearance* of inconsistency.—Again :

"God is a *Spirit*." That is, God is something analogous to the *human* spirit. Of the nature of our own spirit we have no precise idea; although we have some idea of its properties. But if we had the most definite idea of our own spirit, that idea would be *infinitely* short of him who is a Spirit *very different* from ourselves. The idea then conveyed by these words, is not the precise and perfect idea of God. Must we then relinquish it? No: for we have no substitute for it. It is the idea which God himself has suggested. Yet the same difficulty occurs here which we meet in the doctrine of the Trinity : To this imperfect and finite idea, we attribute *infinite perfections*. There is something in the idea, contradictory to what we ascribe to him whom it is supposed to represent. But all the apparent contradiction arises from the imperfection of our idea. We have no alternative, however, but *imperfect knowledge*, or *perfect ignorance*.

* 1. Cor. xiii. v2

As by analogy God has discovered to us his nature in general, so, by analogy, he has discovered to us that great mystery of his nature, the distinction between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and the respective relation of each of them to the other.

1. The first analogy which we trace is that of *Matter*, *Form*, and *Motion*.—It is not asserted that God is anywhere said to be a *material* Being. The passage to which we refer, is that in which, speaking of Jesus Christ, the Apostle says, he “was εἰ μορφὴ Θεοῦ, in the *form* of God.” * Now it is granted that “God is a *Spirit*.” He is not an *extended, solid* substance; and, properly speaking, he has no external *form*. Moses therefore reminded the children of Israel, “Ye saw no *similitude*.” † Form is predicated of God *improperly*, and under the *borrowed* idea of matter. Here then we have the idea of *matter* and its *form*. The Holy Spirit is spoken of as of *matter in motion*. “The Spirit of God *moved* upon the face of the waters.” ‡ It is spoken of as “*descending,—coming*,” and “*going*.” § Motion, however, does not properly belong to spirit, especially to the *omnipresent* Spirit. It is therefore attributed to *immortal* substance, under the borrowed idea of *matter in motion*.—We have then the ideas of *matter*, of the *form* of matter, and of *matter in motion*. What the internal, unknown, *essence* of matter is to material substance, that the unknown Father is in the Divine nature. What the *form* of matter is to the internal, unknown, essence of matter, that the Son is to the Father. As the unknown essence of matter is *perceived* and *distinguished* only by its *external form*, so the Father is perceived and known, only through the Son. As matter *operates* upon matter only by *motion*, so God operates on his creatures, only by the Spirit.

2. The next analogy on which we shall remark, is that of the *Sun*, its *Light*, and its *vital Influence*. The sacred writers, in speaking of God, often allude to the Sun, which is

Of this great world both *Eye* and *Soul*.

“Unto you that fear my name, shall the Sun of righteousness arise.” §—What the *internal, unknown substance* is in the

* Phil. ii. 6. † Deut. iv. 12. ‡ Gen. i. 2. || Luke iii. 22. John i. 32, &c.
1 Chron. xii. 12. 1 Kings xxii. 21. 2 Chron. xviii. 23. § Mal. iv. 2.

Sun, that the Father is in the Godhead. As from the former all natural light proceeds, the latter is “the Father of lights.” What perceptible light is to the internal, unknown substance of the Sun, that the Son is to the Father : “the *απανταύμα της δόξης*, brightness of his glory.” The Son is therefore “the *Light of the world*.” As the Sun is *seen* only by the *light* of his beams, and his beams impress on all nature an *image* of the Sun ; so the Father is *seen* only in the Son ; and in the Son, all, who have eyes to see, *bhold* the Father.—In like manner, what the *vital influence* of the Sun and of its beams is to the *Sun*, and to its *beams*, that the *Holy Spirit* is to the Father, and to the Son. As the *vital influence* flows from the *Sun* through its *beams*, so the *SPRIT* proceeds from the *FATHER*, through the *Son*. And as the *influence* of the *Sun* is the *material origin* and *support* of vegetable and animal *life*, so the *Spirit of God* is the *spiritual cause of life*, to animals and to spirits. “With thee is the *fountain of life*; in thy *light* shall we see *light*.”* “If he gather unto himself his *Spirit* and his *breath*, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust.”†

3. Let us next examine the analogy of *Being*, its *Image*, and its *Operation*. God is *Being* itself: “I AM” is his name. Of that *Being* the *FATHER* is the *unknown, invisible essence*. “No man hath *seen* God at any time; the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the *FATHER*, he hath *declared* him.” Of that unknown *Being*, the Son is the visible *Image*. “Who is the *Image* of the *invisible God*: †—the *Xρακτηρ της υποστάσεως, character of his substance*.”|| The *Holy Spirit* is that *Being operating* on all created being.—“There are diversities of *operations*: but it is the *same God* which *worketh all in all*.—All these *worketh* that one and the self-same *Spirit*.”§—The *Father* is God *hidden* from us: the *Son* is God *revealed* to us: the *Holy Spirit* is God *working* in us.

4. There is also an allusion to *Mind*, *Discourse*, and *Breath*, or *Wisdom*. Mr. G. says, “our most sublime conception of God is as the all-pervading *MIND*.”¶—This

* Psalm xxxvi. 9.

† Job xxiv. 14, 15.

‡ Col. i. 15.

|| Heb. i. 3.

§ 1 Cor. xii. 6—11.

¶ Vol. I. p. 13.

MIND has its λόγος, word, discourse, or reason; “ His name is called ὁ λόγος, the Word of God.” * As the word or discourse of man is conceived by his mind,—is originally in his mind,—is an image of his mind,—when uttered, displays his mind,—and his mind is displayed only, by that discourse; so the WORD of God is conceived by the Father,—is originally in the Father,—is an image of the Father,—in coming forth from the Father displays the Father—and the Father is displayed only by him.—Again, discourse is both internal and external. It is *ratio vel oratio*: “ reason or speech.” Considered in the first point of view, wisdom is the support of reason: and the Holy Spirit is the *Wisdom* of God. “ Therefore also said the *Wisdom* of God.” † &c. Considered in the latter point of view, breath is the support of *speech*: and the Son spake by the Holy *Spirit*, or *breath*. “ Through the Holy Ghost he gave commandments unto the Apostles.” ‡ Hence when the FATHER, whom no man hath known, sent the WORD to declare him, he sent upon him, for that purpose, the SPIRIT without measure.

5. The last analogy which we shall examine, and that which is most generally referred to in scripture, is that of the FATHER, the SON, and one who, sent by the Father and the Son, is, on account of the offices which he sustains, called the COMFORTER. The allusions by which this distinction is made, are very obvious. We have a sufficiently clear idea of the relation of a Son to a Father. We equally understand what it is for one to be sent by a second in the name of a third, to execute the purposes of both. Such are the mission, and the circumstances of the mission, of the Holy Spirit.

Let any one read without prejudice the following passages, and make up his mind as to the nature of the distinction which is there made between the three.—“ I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another *Comforter*.” —“ But the *Comforter*, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, εκείνος, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” —“ When the *Comforter* is come,

* Rev. xix. 13. John i. 1. † Luke xi. 49. ‡ Acts i. 2.

whom *I* will send unto you from the *Father*, even the *Spirit* of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, *εκπονεῖ*, HE shall testify of *me*."—" *I* have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when *εκπονεῖ*, HE the *Spirit* of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of *himself*, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak; and he shall shew you things to come. *Εκπονεῖ*, HE shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you."

Every one who reads these verses, will acknowledge that the distinction here made is the distinction of three persons. Mr. G. himself has granted it. While he uniformly acknowledges a personal distinction between the Father and the Son,—of the Spirit he even says, "It would have been next to an impossibility not to have repeatedly personified this divine influence."* This is all that at present we ask. It is enough that the Socinians themselves authorize us thus to denominate the ideas which, by these forms of speech, are conveyed. Let it then be clearly understood that precisely in this sense we make use of the word person, and its derivatives; viz. to fix an *idea*, which, in the use of the same *terms*, equally strikes the mind of a Socinian, and of a Christian Believer. This *idea* is one of those analogies by which the sacred writers set forth the *distinction* which exists between the THREE.

Now since the sacred writers have, in every case, taught us how to view this subject by analogy, we have *no proper* and *precise* ideas of it. We have no criterion to which to bring any one of these similitudes, but by comparing one with another. To *oppose* one to another of them, (the common practice,) is not the way to receive instruction; because they all stand upon the same authority, and nothing but partiality to one's own opinion can assign a reason why *this*, rather than *that*, shall be relinquished. The only plan that can be vindicated, is, to assign to each of them its proper department,—to compare them together, for the correction of each other,—and to adopt a system which comprehends them *all*.

In attempting to lay down such a plan, it must be observed, that of the five analogies which have been examined, every one gives us some idea of the doctrine of the *Trinity*; but one part of that doctrine is more perfectly taught by one of them, and another part by another.

1. Some of them more perfectly elucidate the *unity* of the three. That unity would never be inferred from the analogy of Father, Son, and Comforter. The idea which we have of three persons, is that of three distinct *BEINGS*. But, *matter*, *form*, and *motion*, include only *one* being. The ideas of *fire*, *light*, and *vital influence*, imply no more than *one Sun*.

2. Some of them shew, much better than the rest, that the distinction is *essential*, *necessary*, and *eternal*. Matter may possibly be *without* motion: but light and heat are *essential* to the Sun, which cannot be supposed for a moment to exist, *as the Sun*, without them: and *energy* is *inseparable* from a *living*, *spiritual*, and perfect Being.—There is not a *perfect* agreement between human *paternity* and *filiation*, and the doctrine of God and his eternal Word. The generation of him “whose *goings forth* have been *from of old*, *from everlasting*,”* is not, like human generation, a *process* which has a *beginning*.—It is not the generation of an *infant*, which must be nourished that it may grow up to manhood; but of one who is “the *same* yesterday, to-day, and for ever.” It is not the generation of *one* being by *another* being; for “the *Word was God*.” It is not the generation of one who may again be *annihilated*; for “the Son abideth *for ever*.” In all these points the analogy is lost. But here, the scriptures afford us another source of ideas: an analogy which takes up the subject where the preceding seems only to contradict what the scriptures have clearly revealed. When the ideas of a *Father* and his *Son* no longer serve, the ideas of a *Being*, and his *Image* conceived by himself, are to be substituted. Here then we have a *new* order of ideas. We lay aside the relation of *paternity* and *filiation*, and consider God as an eternal, ever perfect *Mind*,—always *capable of knowing* himself;—

* Micah v. 2.

always *actually* knowing himself;—always *conceiving* an image of himself:—to whom it is never *possible* that he should be *without* an image of himself, conceived by himself;—whose image of himself, so conceived, must be always *perfect as himself*, because he *always perfectly knows* himself, and contemplates himself with a *capacity to comprehend all his own perfection*;—who, because he is *perfect*, must *perfectly conceive* his own image;—whose image can never vanish, because he *cannot forget* himself, and because he must *love* that image which, like himself, is *perfect*;—and lastly, who can, by that image of himself, which he has conceived, *discover* himself to any intelligent being, in proportion to the capacity of the recipient.—It is equally obvious that an all-perfect and eternal Mind can never have existed without its *λόγος reason or discourse*, and the *wisdom* by which that reason is sustained.—These comparisons illustrate the *essential necessity* of the *distinctions* of the Trinity.

3. The *nature* of the distinction, under the Christian economy, is best illustrated by the *personal* distinction of *Father*, *Son*, and *Comforter*.—In prosecuting the allusion to *human paternity* and *filiation*, the sacred writers have taken a scope that *could not have been allowed* by any other of those comparisons which, on other occasions, they have so much improved. As a son is *begotten* of his father, the Son of God is called “the *only-begotten Son*.”* As a father *conveys* to his son *perfect humanity*, “it pleased the Father that in him (his dear Son) should *all fulness* dwell;” even “all the fulness of the *Godhead*.”† As a son has *all the members, senses, and faculties* which his father has, “*All that the Father hath* (said the Son) is *mine*.”‡ Even Mr. G. ascribes to him the “*divine perfections*.”|| As a father *loveth* his son, so the Father says, “This is my *beloved Son*, in whom I *delight*.”§ As a father *entrusts* his affairs with his confidential son, and makes him the *heir* of his property, so “the Father *loveth* the Son,—hath given *all things* into his hand ¶ and hath appointed him *heir* of all things.”** And lastly, As a son *obeys, serves, and honours* his father,

* John iii. 16, &c. † Col. i. 19, ii. 9. ‡ John xvi. 15. || Vol. I. p. 200.

§ Matt. xvii. 5. ¶ John iii. 35. ** Heb. i. 2.

so the Son of God *obeys, serves, and honours* the Father. How little of this could with propriety be said under any other of those heads of distinction by which the sacred writers have on other occasions illustrated the subject!—In like manner, no other than the personal distinction could have warranted the Holy Spirit's being spoken of as “*searching* all things *even the deep things of God*,” as “*knowing* the things of *God*,” as “*hearing* what he should *speak*,” as “*taking* of the things of the Son and *shewing* them to us,” as *instructing, witnessing, admonishing, reproofing, comforting, willing, calling* men to the ministry, *commanding*, and *interceding*.—And further:—We could not speak with apparent propriety, of the *form* praying the *essence* to send the *motion*:—of a *vital influence* shewing to mankind the things of the *light* which is returned to the *Sun*:—of an *image* which is resorbed by its *original*, and an *energy* which is come to its place:—or of a *word*, which *knows*, and *loves*, and *obeys* the *Mind* from which it proceeds, which is returned to the *bosom* from whence it came, and which has left its *breath* behind to execute its commands, and to comfort mankind during its absence. These scriptural distinctions, it is evident, are, in such cases, of no use: and to apply them to such doctrines of scripture, would only be to give to truth the colour of absurdity. The *personal* distinction is, in such cases, *absolutely necessary*. And this distinction, the most perfect we have found, applied, as the sacred writers have applied it, makes all these truths plain, natural, and easy.

On the whole, We have learned:—1. That the *Trinitarian distinction is revealed*, and consequently can be *known, only by analogy*; and *therefore*, as being revealed only by *imperfect shadows*, is still a *mystery*.—2. That without comprehending the exact truth, we cannot judge of the analogy between that truth and any *other* mean of elucidation; and therefore it is presumptuous to attempt to explain that distinction, in any *other* way than that in which it is explained by divine revelation.—3. That since the Divine Author of the Christian revelation best knows in what degree, and under what form, we are capable of receiving the truth, and

which of all possible views of that truth are likely to be most advantageous to us, it becomes us to adopt such opinions, and to hold such language, as the scriptures have suggested. Or, in the more appropriate expressions of St. Paul: We should speak of the things of God, “not in words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.”

—4. That the Scriptures teach the doctrine of the Trinity, not only when they make a personal distinction between the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, but also when they make a distinction which is not personal.—5. That our *best* conceptions of the subject are very *imperfect*, and therefore, unless we adopt ALL those modes of elucidation which are used by the sacred writers, we cannot, in the explanation of the scriptures, avoid falling into many *absurdities*.—

6. That none of those allusions by which the scriptures illustrate the Trinity, should be pursued *beyond the line of analogy*.—7. That when we perceive ourselves to be led, by the *abuse* of scriptural terms, into any *absurdity*, or into any doctrine *contrary to the plain letter of scripture*, we ought to remember that we have another order of scriptural ideas, which should serve as a clue to guide us out of the labyrinth.—8. That Christianity requires every one of its disciples, whether he embrace or reject the *terms* which are in common use, to maintain the doctrine of a *Trinity in Unity*:—to place it on its proper basis, *divine revelation*;—and to impute whatever of difficulty or *apparent contradiction* he meets, not to the unreasonableness of the doctrine, but to the imperfection of his own conceptions.

Si quid novisti rectius istis,
Candidus imperti: si non, his utere mecum.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

SINCE the preceding pages were written, and some of them were already printed, Mr. G. has published his 9th, 10th, and 11th Lectures, in which he has adopted the opinion, that the Doctrine of the Trinity is the result of a gradual corruption of the doctrine of the gospel. Having zealously endeavoured, through one whole volume of Lectures, to expunge from the scriptures all the prominent evidence of what he denominates “the principal doctrines of Christianity;” on the supposition that he has perfectly succeeded, he proceeds to maintain this opinion by multiplied references to the Fathers of the primitive church.

If they who profess to maintain the doctrines which he has impugned, are prepared to surrender to him the well-fortified citadel of scripture, they must either grant to him the victory, or meet him, to finish the contest, in the extensive fields of ecclesiastical history.

While the reader hesitates, and hopes to find some alternative, Mr. G. peremptorily summons him to surrender. “Look, my Trinitarian friend, at the ground on which you stand, at the year sixty-six. The Apostles, you say, entertained the same views of Christianity as yourself. Well; for thirty-three years they travel into different parts of the world, for the sole purpose of making converts to the Christian religion; the *whole* of that time is exclusively occupied in this important work; and multitudes actually become their disciples. An account of their transactions is given by one of their own body; but he totally omits to state that this doctrine of a Trinity was one of the doctrines which they taught.—Further; in the course of these thirty-three years, the men thus employed, publish *twenty-two*

other works; yet, strange as it may appear, *in none of these works is any one of these peculiar phrases to be found, Trinity in Unity, Three Persons in one God, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.**"

If the reader be a genuine "Trinitarian friend," and have the heart of a Christian soldier, he will not be alarmed by the lofty tone which Mr. G. has assumed. He will perceive, that to give some degree of plausibility to the supposition that the doctrines in question have no support from scripture, this Socinian herald has adopted the contrivance of his predecessors, by substituting the peculiar *phrases of human invention* for the *doctrines taught by divine revelation*.

Without any implied censure on those who deem it their duty to vindicate the phrases to which Mr. G. has objected, and who think themselves adequate to the task,—throughout the whole of this discussion, no vindication of any set of phrases, except those of scripture, has been attempted. Lest *the truth of God* should be exposed to contempt by being identified with *the inventions of men*, it has been designed to extract from the scriptures the genuine Christian doctrine, as much as may be, in the language of the sacred writers: to "speak of spiritual things in spiritual words," and to leave the judicious reader at liberty to make choice of what he deems the most appropriate terms. The contest is not on our part, about *words*, but *things*. When therefore Mr. G. speaks of "*this phrascology*," as being thought "*so essential to salvation*," whom does his arguing reprove?† When he triumphantly asks, "Should one of your missionaries, whether to the east or to the west, preach *one single year*, make *one single convert*, publish *one single book* upon the doctrines he was sent to teach, and *not once mention this important subject*, (in the phraseology so strongly objected to) how would you think he had executed his commission?"‡—we are under no difficulty; for we readily and sincerely answer, that we should not, on this account, as Mr. G. supposes, "designate him a *faithless servant*, who had *neglected his duty*, had *con-*

* Vol. II. p. 2.

† Vol. II. p. 9.

‡ Vol. II. p. 6.

euised the word of God.” “The *phrasology*” of the schools is not the *word of God*, but the word of man. And if he “had not shunned to declare *all* the *counsel of God*,” but had “fully preached” the “*unadulterated*” gospel: if he had been successful in making *converts* (not Socinian converts, *converts* to a mere opinion, but) such as St. Paul was sent to make:—if he had “turned men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they might receive remission of sins, and an inheritance among all them that are sanctified through faith in Christ Jesus;”—we should approve his labours, and rejoice in his success.*

The Socinians themselves use many phrases which are not strictly scriptural: but they are not to be “made offenders for a *word*.” If, in the language of scripture, they can vindicate their metaphysical explanation of that truth, “there is one God;” they are perfectly at liberty to use the phrase, “the *Unity of God*.” If they can *thus* prove that Jesus Christ is no other than a man, they will not be forbidden to insert in their creed the words, “*simple humanity*.” And if they can demonstrate, *from the same source*, that the Holy Spirit is *only* the abstract power of God, we will hold no contest with them on account of their denominating him “the Divine *energy*,” or “an *attribute of God*.” We will leave the “strife of words” to those who admire and love it. What is there then unreasonable in our conduct, if, while we believe the doctrine of the preceding chapters to be the doctrine of the Bible, we find it conve-

* “I dare not,” says the Rev. John Wesley, “insist upon any one’s using the word *Trinity* or *Person*. I use them myself without any scruple, because I know of none better. But if any man has any scruple concerning them, who shall constrain him to use them? I cannot; much less would I burn a man alive, and that with moist, green wood, for saying, ‘Though I believe the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, yet I scruple using the words *Trinity* and *Persons*, because I do not find those terms in the Bible.’” Sermons, Vol. V. p. 31.

The Rev. John Fletcher says, in like manner, “If by renouncing that comprehensive word (*Trinity*,) we could remove the prejudices of Deists against the truth contended for, we would give it up, and always say, *The Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, which is what we mean by the *Trinity*.” Rat. Vin. of the Cath. Faith. p. 39

nient to avoid circumlocution, by expressing our opinion in such terms, as, we are aware, are not used by the sacred writers?

Having thus replied to the insidious insinuation of Mr. G.'s summons, we now declare, more directly, that no force which he has at his command shall cause us to surrender the strong fortress of Scripture authority. Let him “walk about our Zion, and go round about her;” let him “tell her towers, mark well her bulwarks, and consider her palaces.”

Having in the four preceding chapters, stated our opinion of the doctrines under discussion, and having exhibited and established what we deem the most direct and positive proofs that that opinion is scriptural, we are now to shew that those doctrines, so far from being, as Mr. G. holds, the invention of latter ages, have been gradually discovered from the dawn of divine revelation to the *perfect day*.—This argument does not rest on any single text, but on the general tenor of scripture.

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”* “The original word, אלהים, *Elohim*, God, is certainly the plural form of אלה, *el*, or אלהים, *eloah*;† and therefore indicates, to a Hebrew reader, a plurality.

“And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.”‡ The use of the plural pronouns in this passage, is a confirmation of the inference deduced from the preceding: and the pronouns, being personal, convey the idea of personality as well as of plurality.

It does not appear that any created beings were employed in the creation of man; but it is unequivocally declared that, *Elohim*, “God created man in *his* (own) image.”||

When man was fallen from his original rectitude, “the LORD God said, Behold the man is become as *one of us*.”§ This *distributive* manner of speaking indicates, that the distinction already made is not merely verbal but real.

When the LORD God cursed the author of the sin of our first parents, and promised them deliverance, he pro-

* Gen. i. 1. † Dr. Clarke, in loc. ‡ Gen. i. 26. || Gen. i. 27.

§ Gen. iii. 22.

mised that deliverance by one who should be their *seed*. “ I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed : he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”*

Of the fulfilment of this great promise, God gave frequent pledges, by the appearance of a *Divine Person* to the Patriarchs, and to the Jewish Chiefs. This Person at first appeared under the human form ; but, before his departure, his Divinity was generally known and acknowledged by those to whom he appeared, and with whom he conversed. By being denominated the *Word* or the *Angel of Jehovah*, or the *Captain of Jehovah’s host*, the distinction already discovered is exhibited : but by being also styled *Jehovah*, his *Divinity* is maintained.

“ The *Word* of the Lord came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram : I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.” This *Word* of the Lord, ABRAM addressed as Jehovah. “ And Abram said, *Jehovah, God,*” &c. Gen. xv. 1, 2. Compare also v. 4. 7. 8. 18.

“ *Jehovah* appeared to Abraham in the plains of Mamre. As Abraham sat in the tent-door in the heat of the day, he lift up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood by him.”† One of these is called *Jehovah*. “ And *Jehovah* said unto Abraham, Wherefore did Sarah laugh ?”

Of these men, two proceeded towards Sodom. (Compare Gen. xviii. 22. xix. 1.) But the one who was called *Jehovah*, remained and communed with Abraham. Of him it is related : “ And *Jehovah* said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do ? ‡ And *Jehovah* said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great,” &c. (v. 20.)—See also verses 22. 26. &c..—In the next chapter, still keeping up the *distinction* which we have observed, and yet maintaining the proper *Divinity* of him who destroyed the devoted cities, it is said, “ Then *Jehovah* rained, upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah, brimstone and fire from *Jehovah* out of heaven.”||

“ And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Take now thy son,

* Gen. iii. 15. † Gen. xviii. 1, 2. ‡ Gen. xviii. 17. || Gen. xix. 24.

thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah, and offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of."* When Abraham had perfectly manifested his faith and obedience, "The *Angel of Jehovah*, (or the Angel *Jehovah*,) called unto him out of heaven, and said, Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me."†—Here we see that the Angel *Jehovah*, was the "God" who "did tempt Abraham."

It is still more remarkable that on this occasion, the "Angel *Jehovah*," who had required Abraham to offer up his son, and to offer him up to *himself*, as to God, "called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By MYSELF have I sworn, saith Jehovah, [he could swear by no greater ;] for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not with-held thy son, thine only son ; that in blessing *I* will bless thee,—because thou hast obeyed *my* voice."‡—Here we see that the *Angel* who appeared to Abraham, was the **God** who commanded this sacrifice ; to whom it was in purpose offered ; who accepted it as offered to HIMSELF ; who made the great promise to Abraham ; and who sware by HIMSELF :—in a word, JEHOVAH.

"The *Angel of God* spake unto Jacob in a dream, saying, Jacob. And he said, *I am the God of Bethel*, where thou anointedst the pillar, and where thou vowedst a vow unto me."|| Now the *God of Bethel* is he of whom it is said, "And behold *Jehovah* stood above it (the mysterious ladder) and said, I am Jehovah the God of Abraham thy Father, and the God of Isaac."§ And the vow which Jacob vowed to him was this : "If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peacee : then shall JEHOVAH be my God. And this stone which I have set for a pillar, shall be God's house : and of all that thou shalt give me, I will surely give the tenth unto thee."¶ To Jacob, therefore, it was obvious that "the *Angel of God*" was JEHOVAH, GOD HIMSELF.

* Gen. xxii. 1, 2,

|| Gen. xxxi. 11, 13.

† Gen. xxii. 12.

§ Gen. xxviii. 13.

‡ Gen. xxii. 15—18.

¶ Gen. xxviii. 20, 22.

When Jacob was returning to his father's house, he "was left alone: and there wrestled a *man* with him until the breaking of the day." When this *man* had put forth his power, and by a touch had disjointed Jacob's thigh, Jacob discerned his divine visitant, and said, "I will not let *thee* go, except thou bless me. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince hast thou power with *God* and with men, and hast prevailed. And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name; and he said, Wherefore is it, that thou dost ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: *for I have seen God face to face*, (said he) and my life is preserved."*—Whatever others may think, it was obvious to Jacob, that this *man* was no other than *God* himself.

"The *angel* of *Jehovah* appeared to Moses, in Horeb, in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush." This angel is called *Jehovah*,—*God*,—the *God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob*,—*Jehovah, God of the Hebrews*,—*I AM*,—and *I AM THAT I AM*,—throughout the chapter. Exodus iii. See also chap. iv. et seq.

When Jehovah sent Moses to lead his people Israel to the land of Canaan, he was pleased to promise, "Behold, I send an *angrl* before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared."† But of this *angel*, Jehovah said, "Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my NAME is in him."‡ This *angel* then had the power, authority, and name of Jehovah.

"When Joshua was by Jericho, behold there stood a *man* over against him, with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay, but as captain (or prince) of the host of Jehovah am I now come. And Joshua, (well understanding this language,) fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant? And the captain of Jehovah's host, (approving this,) said unto Joshua, (in the

* Gen. xxxii. 24,—30.

† Exod. xxiii. 20.

‡ Exod. xxiii. 21.

language of Jehovah to Moses,) *Loose thy shoe from off thy foot, for the place whereon thou standest is holy.*"*—This captain of Jehovah's host is immediately called Jehovah. " And Jehovah said unto Joshua,"† &c.

" The angel of Jehovah appeared unto Gideon, and said unto him, Jehovah is with thee, thou mighty man of valour."‡ Here also the angel is styled *Jehovah*. " And Jehovah looked upon him, and said, Go in this thy might, and thou shalt save Israel from the hand of the Midianites: have not I sent thee?" See Judges vi. 14. 16. 23.

" The angel of Jehovah appeared to Manoah and his wife. And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God." See Judges xiii.

Such were the manifestations which God gave to his people, till the time of the Judges of Israel.

We may now perceive on what authority Job was enabled to say, " I know that my *Redeemer* (now) liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth."||

The knowledge of the Redeemer of mankind was still further imparted to David, who spake of him as the *Son* and the (*Messiah*) *anointed* of Jehovah. " Jehovah hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee."§—What were David's views of his *person*, we may understand from his subjoining, " Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little: *blessed* are all they that put their *trust* in him :"¶—For the saints of the Old Testament were not ignorant that "*cursed* is the man that *trusteth* in (mere) *man*;" and that, "*blessed* is the man that *trusteth* in *Jehovah*."**

That David wrote the forty-fifth Psalm with reference to the expected Messiah, and not to Solomon, is abundantly proved from the Psalm itself. The language of the Psalm is not at all applicable to Solomon. He was not the man of war, who "girded his sword upon his thigh:" (v. 3.)—whose "right hand taught him terrible things:" (v. 4.)—whose "arrows were sharp in the hearts of the king's

* Jos. v. 13—15. † Jos. vi. 2. ‡ Jud. vi. 12. || Jub. xix. 26.

§ Psalm ii. 7. ¶ Psalm ii. 12. ** Jer. xvii. 5.7.

enemies;" or, "under whom the people fell." (v. 5.)—He was not remarkable for "loving righteousness," or, "hating iniquity." (v. 7.)—His "throne is (*not*) for ever and ever." (v. 6.)—His children were *not* "made princes in all the earth." (v. 16.)—Nor do "the people praise" him or his spouse, "for ever and ever." (v. 17.)—Yet these are the terms in which David speaks of the subject of this Psalm. On the other hand, these terms are applicable to the Messiah. *He* is the "king," (v. 1.) set upon the holy hill of Zion. Compare Psal. ii. 6. *He* is "fairer than the children of men, grace is poured into his lips." (v. 2.) *He* is "*anointed* with the oil of gladness above his fellows." *Him* "God hath blessed for ever and ever." (v. 2.)—Now in this Psalm, of which the Messiah *is* so clearly the subject, the writer, who had called the "king," the *Son of God*, in his address to this "*king*," says, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever."*

The Messiah was now known as the *Son of God*, and his *name* was deemed a *mystery*. If the "angel Jehovah" said to Jacob, "Wherefore dost thou ask after my *name*?" and to Manoah, "Why askest thou thus after my *name*, seeing it is *secret*? (or wonderful,) Agur, perhaps with equal reference to the mystery of the *incarnation*, asks, "Who hath ascended up into heaven, or descended? Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? Who hath bound the waters in a garment? Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is *his name*, and what is his *Son's name*, if thou canst tell?" †—Both are equally mysterious.

Isaiah, so often and so justly styled "the evangelical prophet," in prospect of the coming of the Messiah, breaks out, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his *name* shall be called *Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The Father of the everlasting age, The Prince of peace*. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be

* Our argument does not admit of our quoting, in this place, the testimony of the Author of the epistle to the Hebrews, who, however, cites the words of this Psalm, as the words of *God to the Son*.

† Prov. xxx. 4.

no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever! The zeal of *Jehovah* of hosts will perform this.”* Having spoken thus of the humiliation and exaltation, the humanity and the divinity of the Messiah, he returns to the same subject, in different language. “There shall come forth a *rod* out of the stem of Jesse, and a *branch* shall grow out of his roots, and the Spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him. † And in that day (says he) there shall be a *root* of Jesse which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious. ‡—In that day thou shalt say, behold God is my *salvation*, I will trust (in such a Saviour) and not be afraid; for the *Lord JEHOVAH* is my *strength* and my *song*, he also is become my *salvation*.” || “It was impossible for a spiritual Jew to read this description of the Messiah’s peaceful kingdom, without seeing that this Root of Jesse, this *Holy One* of Israel, so great in the midst of Zion, was the same *wonderful* Person whom the prophet had just before called the *Son* given and the *mighty God*;” § that he was that *Jehovah* who should become their *Saviour*.

The same prophet, introducing the harbinger of the Messiah, exclaims, “The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of JEHOVAH, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.—And the *glory* of JEHOVAH shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.” ¶

Again: “O Zion, that bringest good tidings—say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God. Behold the *LORD GOD* will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold his reward is with him, and his work before him. He shall feed his *flock* like a *shepherd*.** Who this *Shepherd* is, the Jews, without the New Testament, could understand. The prophet Ezekiel would inform them, “I will set one *Shepherd* over them, and he shall feed them,

* Isa. ix. 6, 7. † Isa. xi. 1, 2. ‡ Isa. xi. 10. || Isa. xii. 2.

§ Fletcher’s Rat. Vin. ¶ Isa. xl. 3, 5. ** Isa. xl. 9—11.

even my servant David, he shall *feed* them, and he shall be their *Shepherd*.”*

Jeremiah is the author of that direct testimony to the *Divinity* of the Messiah:—“Behold the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David a righteous *branch*, and a *king* shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, *Jehovah our Righteousness*.”† See page 97.

Zeechariah, speaking prophetically of the Messiah as the Shepherd of Israel, says, “Awake, O sword, against my *Shepherd*, and against the *man* that is *my Fellow*, saith the *Lord of hosts*. ”‡

Such are the testimonies which the writers of the Old Testament afford of the person and character of the Messiah.—If we enquire what they taught concerning the *Holy Spirit*, we shall find the outlines of the doctrine which we have already derived from the New Testament.

That in the Old Testament there is frequent notice of the *Holy Spirit*, is too obvious to need any proof.—As he is there denominated the *Spirit of God*, an enlightened Jew could entertain no doubt of his proper Divinity. Mr. G. has granted that it is as obvious that the *Spirit of God* is *God*, as that the *spirit of man* is *man*. (See Lect. Vol. I. p. 123.) The Old Testament is not, however, without further proof of this. “The hand of the *Lord God* fell there upon me—and *he* (the Lord God) put forth the form of an hand, and *took me* by a lock of mine head, and the *Spirit* lift me up, between the earth and the heaven.”|| Here the same Being, who is denominated the *Lord God*, is also denominated the *Spirit*. Thus, in Judges xv. 14. it is expressly said, “The *Spirit of the Lord* came mightily upon him.” (Samson.) Yet when the *Spirit* departed from him, it is said, “He wist not that the *Lord* was departed from him.” (v. 16. 20.) The *Spirit of Jehovah*, and *Jehovah*, are therefore one and the same Being.

To the *Spirit of God* the writers of the Old Testament,

* Ezek. xxxiv. † Jer. 23. 5, 6. ‡ Zech. xiii. 7. || Ezek. vii. 13.

therefore, attribute the Divine perfections of *omnipresence, omniscience, and omnipotence*. See pages 119, 120, 121.

Hence, even the Old Testament introduces the *Spirit of God* as one of the *Elohim* to whom creation is ascribed.—“And the *Spirit of God* moved upon the face of the waters.”*—“By his *Spirit* he hath garnished the heavens.”†—“The *Spirit of God* hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.”‡—“Thou sendest forth thy *Spirit*, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth.”||

We have now the true explanation of the *Elohim* who in the beginning made the heavens and the earth. “By the WORD of the LORD were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the *breath* (*Heb. SPIRIT*) of his mouth.”§

This great subject is still further illustrated in the purposed work of redemption, as in the following passages:—“Hearken unto me, O Jacob, and Israel my called:—I am he; I am the *first*, I also am the *last*. Mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens: when I call unto them, they stand up together.—And now the LORD God and his SPIRIT hath sent me.”¶ The Jewish reader would perceive, not only the *Divine* character of the Speaker, but his mission by *God* and by his *Spirit*. In this passage, the distinction is, like what we have found in the New Testament, a personal distinction. *One* person is the Speaker, *Two* others have sent him.—Again: “The *Spirit of the LORD God* is upon me, (the *Messiah*, the *anointed*:) because the *LORD* has *anointed* me to preach good tidings unto the meek,” &c. **—Once more: “Seek ye out of the book of the *LORD*, and read—for MY mouth it hath commanded, and HIS SPIRIT it hath gathered them.”††—“In these words, (says Mr. Jones) there is *one* person speaking of the *Spirit of another person*.”

Such are some of the many passages contained in the Old Testament, by which the doctrines under discussion have been gradually discovered. It is true, the Socinians have

* Gen. i. 2. † Job. xx. 30. ‡ Job xxx. 4. || Psalm civ. 30.

§ Psalm xxxiii. 6. ¶ Isa. xlvi. 12—16 ** Isa. lxi. 1. †† Isa. xxxiv. 16.

much to object ; and, in the course of this developement, we have taken but little notice of them. And it is equally true, that we also have much to say in confirmation of our own comments on these passages. Much useful light might have been cast on the subject of this chapter by comparing the Old Testament with the New. But such a measure, whatever good purpose it might have answered, would have been a deviation from our present design. The preceding quotations have been made by way of appeal to the candour of the unprejudiced reader, in proof, that the *doctrine*, though not the *phrase*, of the *Trinity* originated with Moses and the Prophets, and that the very doctrine of the preceding chapters is nearly, if not fully, maintained by a dispensation preceding the Christian. The question now to be examined, is not, “ What will a prejudiced Socinian object to the language of the Old Testament ? ” or, “ How will an enlightened Christian comment upon it ? ” But, “ What was the light in which this part of divine revelation would strike a studious and unprejudiced Jew ? ”

“ The Hebrew doctors supposed the first verse of Genesis to contain some latent mystery. The Rabbi Ibba indeed expressly says it does, and adds, This mystery is not to be revealed till the coming of the Messiah.” *

“ An eminent Jewish Rabbi, Simeon ben Joachi, in his comment on the sixth section of Leviticus, has these remarkable words : ‘ Come and see the mystery of the word *Elohim* : there are *three* degrees, and each degree by itself *alone*, and yet notwithstanding they are all *one*, and *joined together in one*, and are not divided from each other.’ ” †

“ The Jewish Rabbi, Limborsch, tells us, that in the word *Elohim* there are *three* degrees, each *distinct by itself*, yet all *one*, *joined in one*, and *not divided* from one another.” ‡

“ R. Bechai, a celebrated author among the Jews, discoursing of the word *Elohim*, has these words : ‘ According to the Cabbalistical way, this name *Elohim*, is two words, namely, *El him*, that is, *They are God*. But the explana-

* Simpson on the Deity of Jesus, p. 352. † Dr. A. Clarke in loc.

‡ Leslie’s Short Method with the Deists.

tion of the Jod is to be fetched from Eccles. xii. 1. Remember thy *Creators*. He that is prudent will understand it.”*

“ The author of *Midras Tillim*, on Exodus xx. 5. says, ‘ I am the *Lord*, thy *God*, a *jealous God*.’ *Three* answering to the *three* by whom the world was made.”†

The Chaldee paraphrase does undoubtedly represent the sense of the Jews in general, as it is their public interpretation of scripture. What we find common and frequent in it, we must suppose to be the general opinion of that people. “ Now it is certain that this Paraphrast doth often use *memra*, the *Word* of God, for Jehovah, God himself, and that especially with relation to the creation of the world. As Isa. xlv. 12. ‘ I made the earth,’ the Chaldee translateth, ‘ I by my *Word* made the earth.’ And Gen. i. 27. we read, *Et Creavit Deus hominem*. ‘ And God created man;’ the Jerusalem Targum, *Verbum Domini creavit hominem*: ‘ The *Word* of God created man;’ And most clearly, Gen. iii. 8. *Audierunt vocem Domini Dei*: ‘ They heard the voice of the Lord God;’ the Chaldee Paraphrase, *Et audierunt vocem Verbi Domini Dei*: And they heard the voice of the *Word* of the Lord God.”‡

On the celebrated prophecy of Isaiah, (chap. ix. 6.) universally applied to the Messiah, the Chaldee Paraphrase says, “ His name shall be called—*God*, a man enduring to eternity, *CHRIST*.”—The Syriac says, “ His name is called *Admiration*, and *Counsellor*, the *most Mighty God of Ages*.”—The Arabic:—“ His name shall be called—the *strong God*.”|| In the Vatican copy of the Septuagint, this passage is evidently mutilated. There the Messiah is abridged of all his high titles, and is simply called, *Μεγαλος Βουλης αγγελος*, ‘ the angel of the great counsel.’ This is a comment, rather than a translation. There are, however, several reasons for supposing that the Seventy originally *translated* this verse. “ Eusebius (D. E. p. 336.) gives the Greek Version uncorrupted, ‘ Wonderful Counsellor, *Mighty God*.’”§

* Kidder’s Demonstration of the Messiah, Part III. p. 81. † Ibid. p. 84.

‡ Pearson on the Creed, p. 117. || Simpson on the Deity of Jesus, p. 96.

§ Simpson on the Deity of Jesus, p. 98.

The Jews attribute also the name Jehovah to the Messiah. “ In the *Sepher Ikkarim*, L. ii. c. 8. ‘ The Scripture calleth the name of the Messias, *Jehovah our righteousness.*’ And *Midrasch Tillim* on Psalm xxi, ‘ God calleth the *Messias* by his own name, and his name is Jehovah; as is said (Exod. xv. 3.) ‘ The Lord is a man of war, Jehovah is his name.’ And it is written of the Messias, (Jer. xxiii. 6.) ‘ And this is the name which they shall call him, *Jehovah our righteousness.*’ Thus Echa Rabati, (Lam. i. 6.) ‘ What is the name of the Messias? R. Abba said, Jehovah is his name, as it is said, (Jer. xxiii. 6.) And this is the name which they shall call him, *Jehovah our righteousness.*’ The same he reports of Rabbi Levi.” *

Such were the opinions of the Jews. Whether they were founded in *truth*, is not the present question. It is enough that they held such opinions, and that they derived them from Moses and the Prophets.—We proceed to the New Testament.

When Jesus had been baptized by John in Jordan, he “ went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the *Spirit of God* descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*” † Having witnessed this introductory revelation of the *Son of God*, the Baptist “ bare witness of him and proclaimed, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before me. And of his fulness have all we (already) received, and grace for grace. For the law was given by Moses, but *grace* and truth came (always) by Jesus Christ. No man hath seen God at any time; the *only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father*, he hath (always hitherto) declared him.—And John bare record, saying, I saw the *Spirit* descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not: but that he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the *Spirit* descending, and remaining on him, the

* Pearson on the Creed, p. 112.

† Matt. iii. 16, 17.

same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw, and bare record that this is *the Son of God.*" *

The meaning of this phrase, "the Son of God," we must now examine.—Under the Christian dispensation, mere men, because they are "the offspring of God," and are "made in the likeness of God," and because they are restored to the paternal favour and holy image of God, in Christ Jesus, are denominated "*the sons of God.*" In the appellation given to Jesus Christ, there is, however, something by which he is distinguished from all others.

1. The sons of men are constituted the sons of God, *through him.* "As many as received *him*, to them *gave he power to become* the sons of God, even *to them that believe on his name.*" † For ye are all the children of God, *by faith in Christ Jesus.*" ‡

2. They are made the sons of God by adoption : "pre-destinated to the *adoption* of children by Jesus Christ." || *He is begotten* of the Father : "*Jehovah* hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I *begotten thee.*" § He is therefore called God's *own or proper Son.* "He that spared not *τὸν ἴδιον γινόμενον*, his *own or proper Son.*"

3. To distinguish him still further from all others, he is repeatedly styled the *only-begotten Son.* "God so loved the world that he gave his *only-begotten Son.*" In Mr. G.'s opinion, this expression only means "well or best-beloved :" in proof of which he observes, that "Isaac is called the "only-begotten Son of Abraham, who had an *older son* living at *the time.*" ¶ This answer is plausible, but not solid. "The promises" which Abraham "had received," related to a son whom Sarah should bear to him.—"And God said (to Abraham), Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a *son* indeed ;—and I will establish my covenant with *him* for an everlasting covenant, and with *his seed after him.*" ** In the Apostle's sense, therefore, Isaac was Abraham's *only-begotten son* : the *only one* in whom the promises could be fulfilled : the *only son* of his mother. And just so, the

* John i. 15—18, 32—34. † John i. 12. ‡ Gal. iii. 26. || Eph. i. 5.

§ Psalm ii. 7. ¶ Vol. I. p. 339. ** Gen. xvii. 15—19.

"*only-begotten Son of God*" is a Son *sui generis*: the *only one* of that kind.

4. This truth our Lord has illustrated, and this interpretation he has confirmed, when in allusion to himself he says, "Having yet therefore *one* Son, his well-beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, 'They will reverence my Son.'" *

5. He is therefore distinguished from Moses and the prophets, as the *Son of God*. "God who spake unto the fathers by the *prophets*, hath in these last days spoken to us by *his Son*. †—Moses, verily, was faithful in all his house, as a *servant*; but Christ as a *Son* over his own house." ‡

6. God's giving his Son, is made the measure of the divine benevolence and beneficence. "God so loved the world, that he gave his *only-begotten Son*. ||—He that spared not his own Son but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us *all things*?" § But if Jesus Christ be the Son of God, only in a sense in which mankind in general may become the sons of God, what illustration or proof does such a gift afford of the infinite benevolence or beneficence of the Father?

7. The greatest possible blessings depend on our *believing* that he is the Son of God. "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus *is the Son of God*?" ¶—Whosoever shall *confess* that Jesus *is the Son of God*, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." ** Is it probable that such privileges should be attached to an acknowledgment that Jesus Christ was, in the common sense of the word, a child of the Most High?

8. Something extraordinary must be intended by the phrase, because he himself says, "No one knoweth the Son, but the Father." †† And when Simon Peter confessed, "Thou art Christ, *the Son of the living God*, Jesus answered and said, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but *my Father which is in heaven*." ‡‡

* Mark xii. 6.

|| John iii. 16.

** 1 John iv. 15.

† Heb. i. 4, 2.

§ Rom. viii. 32.

¶ Matt. xi. 27.

‡ Heb. iii. 5, 6.

¶ 1 John v. 8.

‡‡ Matt. xvi. 17.

These observations may at least authorize us to institute an enquiry into the particular meaning of this phrase.

The Socinians uniformly take advantage of this appellation, and of many things which are affirmed concerning Jesus Christ, as “the Son of God,” to point out and prove his “inferiority and subordination to the Father.” After the manner of most Trinitarians, we have as uniformly answered their arguments by applying it to his human nature. (See pp. 76—82.) This reply is not an evasion, but is founded in truth, and accords with the declaration of the Angel to Mary: “that holy thing *which shall be born* of thee shall be called *the Son of God*.”* We now contend, that “that holy thing” which was “born of the virgin, was called “*the Son of God*,” because it was united with the Divine Nature; for after it was announced by John the Baptist, that Jesus is “the Son of God,” it was always demonstrated by the manifestation of his Divine Perfections, and was the uniform inference which was drawn by *believers* from such manifestations.

When John had declared Jesus Christ to be *the Son of God*, the next day he pointed out “the Lamb of God” to Andrew and another of his disciples.—Andrew brought to Jesus his brother Simon Peter; and Jesus, by shewing to Simon how perfectly he knew him, confirmed to him the testimony of Andrew. The day following, Jesus found Philip, who, being of the city of Andrew and Peter, had probably learned these things from them, and called him to be one of his immediate followers. Thus made acquainted with the character of Jesus, “Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.” When Nathanael’s prejudice was vanquished, and he was coming “to see,” Jesus confirmed the testimony of Philip, by demonstrating his omniscience. And Nathanael, “believing” because Jesus said unto him, I saw thee under the fig-tree, “answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, *Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.*”†—Thus, the faith of the Apostles was founded on

* Luke i. 35.

† John i. 35—51.

the testimony of John the Baptist, and confirmed, not by the testimony of Jesus, but by the evidence of his omniscience.

The next day he confirmed their faith by a manifestation of his omnipotence, when he turned the water into wine. "This beginning of miracles," says the Evangelist, "did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his *glory* [the glory of his omnipotence, and of his Divine Nature,] and his disciples believed on him:"* that is, they believed more firmly the testimony of John concerning him.

The man who was born blind, and whose eyes our Lord had opened, had previously heard nothing of Jesus' being the Son of God; but having been the subject of so great a miracle, and hearing this great truth from Jesus himself, he believed the *testimony* on the evidence of the *miracle*. In what sense he believed it, is obvious from the account which the Evangelist John has given of him: "He said, Lord I *believe*, and worshipped him."†

The same inference was drawn from the same premises, and in the same manner, by the men who witnessed another of his miracles. "When they (Jesus and Peter) were come into the ship, the wind ceased. Then they that were in the ship came, and worshipped him, saying, *Of a truth thou art the Son of God.*"‡

When Jesus said to Mary, the sister of Lazarus, "I am the resurrection and the life: [I raise the dead and support the living:] — Believest thou this?" — Mary answered, "Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God."|| Thus, if others inferred that he is the Son of God from the manifestation of his omnipotence, *Mary* inferred his *omnipotence* from his being the *Son of God*.

The numberless *miracles* which Jesus wrought are recorded in confirmation of this truth. "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that ye might *believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."§

* John ii. 11. † John ix. 38. ‡ Matt. xiv. 32, 33. || John xi. 25—27.

§ John xx. 30, 31.

From all these passages, it is obvious in what sense this phrase was understood in the days of our Lord's ministry. No one thought of his being *the Son of God*, until it was *revealed*. When his disciples witnessed his divine perfections of omniscience or omnipotence, they accepted them as proofs of his Divinity, and consequently believed and acknowledged him to be the Son of God. And when they acknowledged him to be the Son of God, as a proof that in so doing they acknowledged his Divinity, they worshipped him.

If further proof, that this phrase was then used to signify proper Divinity, be necessary, we have it from the *adversaries* of Jesus, who plainly shew that in this sense it was generally understood.

1. "When the Tempter came to Jesus, he said, If thou be a *Son of God*, command that these stones be made bread."* He expected it should be proved that Jesus is *the Son of God*, by the manifestation of Divine perfections. And he received such evidence of the *knowledge* of Jesus who called him by his *name*, and of the *power* of Jesus by whom he was perfectly discomfited, that the demons were forced to cry out, saying, "Thou art Christ, the Son of God."†

2. The Jews uniformly shew, that this was the idea which the phrase in question conveyed to them.—When, on one occasion, they persecuted Jesus, and sought to slay him because he had healed a man on the sabbath-day, he "answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also, that God was his *ἰδιος*, *proper* Father, making himself *equal with God*."‡ It is scarcely necessary to observe, (1.) that, as Father and Son are correlative terms, by calling God his *Father*, (in connection with the assertion, that his works were such as the works of the Father,) he led the Jews to suppose that he meant to call God *ἴδιον πατέρα*, his *proper Father*, and thereby made himself equal with God:—or (2.) that our Lord did not treat them as if they misunderstood him, but went on to confirm the statement which he had already given.

* Matt. iv. 3.

† Luke iv. 41.

‡ John v. 17, 18.

At another time, they said unto him, “Thou blasphemest,” and were about to stone him, “because he said, *I am the Son of God.*”*—They construed this expression into blasphemy, “because (said they) that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.”†—At a subsequent time, the Sanhedrim were united in the same opinion. When Jesus had confessed himself to be “*the Son of God,*” the High Priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy: “and the scribes and elders said, He is guilty of death.”‡—And lastly, When he was crucified, they expected that if he were the Son of God he was omnipotent. Hence they said, “If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.”||

Thus we find that the Divine perfections were manifested in Jesus Christ, as demonstrations of his being a Divine person. Mr. G. and his Socinian brethren affect to overlook this kind of evidence, and perpetually call for clear and positive declarations of the Divinity of our Lord, from his own mouth. By this manœuvre a *thousand witnesses* are silenced, in the many divine miracles which he daily wrought among the people, and by which he “shewed forth his glory.” Yet the manifestation of his Divine perfections was the most proper mean of establishing the belief of his Deity. Without such evidence the *assertion* of Jesus Christ must have passed for nothing. An impostor may give out, like Simon Magus, that he is “the great power of God;” but *he* only who manifests the *Divine perfections*, and does “the works of God,” gives satisfactory proof of his Divinity. When “the Jews sought to kill our Lord, because—he said that God was his Father, making himself equal with God,—Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.—*If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.* There is another that beareth witness of me, and I know that the witness which he witnesseth of me is true. Ye sent unto John, and *he* bare witness unto the truth. But I have greater witness than that of John, for the *works* which the Father hath given me to finish, the

* John x. 32. 36. † v. 33. ‡ Matt. xxvi. 63—36. || Matt. xxvii. 40.

same works that I do, bear witness of me.—And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me.”*

That we have not reasoned falsely on these premises, we have a decisive proof in the argument which Jesus Christ himself used. “ Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest ; because I said, *I am the Son of God* ? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works ; that ye may know, and believe, that the *Father is in me, and I in him.*”† Here we see, that, in our Lord’s opinion, his miraculous works evinced his union with the Godhead, and his union with the Godhead was what he alluded to in denominating himself *the Son of God*.

The multiplied evidences of our Lord’s divinity, derived from the miracles which, with Divine power, he wrought during the years of his public ministry, are supposed by the Socinians to be unsatisfactory, because the disciples themselves were not thereby immovably fixed in the belief of that doctrine. “ When he was seized by men,” says our opponent, “ they all forsook him and fled ; a demonstration as decisive as can possibly be given of the opinion they entertained of his person,”‡—This argument is the most futile that one could wish an adversary to advance. We know that the faith of the disciples, till the descent of the Holy Spirit, was exceedingly weak and unsteady. Their cowardice on this occasion was not “ a decisive demonstration” of their faith, but of their unbelief.

Whatever they had believed concerning him, whether, that he was equal with God, that he was the Son of God, or that he was the Messiah,—they now doubted. Hence, when, after a long conversation with him, they said, “ Now we are sure that thou knowest all things, and needest not that any man should ask thee : by this we believe that thou camest forth from God :—Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe ? Behold the hour cometh, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone.”||—But notwithstanding this their unbelief, and their desertion

* John v. 18, 19, 31—33, 36, 37.

† John x. 36—38.

‡ Vol. II. p. 9.

|| John xvi. 30—32.

of their Master, they had previously “ trusted that it had been *he which should have redeemed Israel.*”

When he “ who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, was declared to be the *Son of God* with power, *according to the Spirit of holiness*, by the resurrection from the dead,” * then their faith became victorious, they openly acknowledged his Divinity, and no more deserted him or his cause.

Thomas, though the most obstinate in his unbelief, was the first to make confession of his subsequent faith. The demonstration of our Lord’s Divinity was now complete, and constrained him to exclaim, “ My Lord, and my God !”

But especially when they had received that Spirit whom Jesus had promised to them, who “ spake not of himself but glorified ” the Saviour ; who should “ guide them into *all truth* ;” who should “ take of the things ” of Christ, and “ shew them unto them :” and who should demonstrate to them that “ *all the Father hath is his*,—that the *Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father*,”—then they did not, as Mr. G. has rashly asserted, “ *INVARIABLY style him a man* : ” † but unanimously declared his Divinity. Matthew announced him to be “ *God with us*. ” ‡ Peter denominated him “ *LORD of all*. ” § Paul asserted, to the Romans, that he “ *is over all, God blessed for evermore* ; ” ¶—to the Corinthians, that “ *to us there is one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things*, ¶—and that *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself*; **—to the Ephesians, that he is “ *the fulness of him that filleth all in all*, that he is *Christ and God* ; ” ††—to the Philippians, that “ *he was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God* ; ” ‡‡—to the Colossians, that “ *it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell* ; ” ||| that in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily ; §§ that by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers :

* Rom. i. 3, 4. † Vol. II. p. 9. ‡ Matt. i. 28. ¶ Acts x. 36. § Rom. ix. 5.
¶ 1 Cor. viii. 6. ** 2 Cor. v. 19. †† Eph. i. 23. Eph. v. 5. ‡‡ Phil. ii. 6.

||| Col. i. 19. §§ Col. ii. 9.

all things were created by him and for him ; and (that) he is before all things, and by him all things consist ;”*—to Tinothy, that God was manifest in the flesh ;”†—to Titus, that “the GREAT GOD, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, gave himself for us ;”‡—to the Hebrews, that “by him God made the worlds, that he is upholding all things by the word of his power, || that unto the Son he (the Father) saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, § and that *οὐτὸς ἡ* was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house. For every house is builded *νῶο τίνος*, by some one, but he that built all things is God.”¶ John asserted, that he “was God, and that all *things were made by him*, and *without him was not any thing made that was made*; ** that he is the TRUE GOD, and eternal life.”†† Jude spake of him as “the *only wise God*, our Saviour ;—the *only Governor God*, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”‡‡

While they thus unanimously speak of his Godhead, they attribute to him those infinite perfections which belong to no being but the Deity. They represent him as being “before all things ;”||| as having “all power, in heaven and on earth ;”§§ and therefore *being in heaven and on earth* : as having in him “all the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge ;” and as “able to save and to destroy.”¶¶ See p. 73. His Godhead, therefore, can be denied, only on principles which separate between the Divine perfections, and the Divine nature. See pp. 74, 75.

On this ascription of Divinity and Divine perfections to Jesus Christ, the whole system of apostolic doctrine is founded : and the latter so necessarily implies the former, that all must stand or fall together.—For instance :

1. According to the apostles, we are to behold “the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.”*** But how can God be seen in him, if God be not in him? or how can Jesus Christ display to us the glory of the Divine perfections, unless he possess them ?

*Col. i. 16, 17. †1 Tim. iii. 16. ‡Tit. ii. 13. || Heb. i. 2, 3. § Heb. i. 8.

¶Heb. iii. 3, 14. **John i. 1, 3. ††1 John i. 20. ‡‡Jude 4. 25.

||| Col. i. 17. §§ Matt. xxviii. 28. ¶¶ James iv. 12. *** 2 Cor. iv. 6.

2. The Apostles refer us to him for pardon, assuring us that he is “exalted a Prince and a Saviour to give forgiveness of sins.” * Who can forgive sins but God only? How then can Jesus forgive sins if he be not God? Must not he who dispenses pardons, be supreme? Must not God be in Christ, to reconcile the world to himself?

3. The apostles attribute to him the new creation. Of this new creation man is the principal subject. He is created “after God, in righteousness and true holiness.” † But are not wisdom, power, and goodness, equal to what were exerted in making man in the Divine image, necessary to this purpose? Who but God can *re-produce* what once was the perfection of the work of God?

4. The Apostles inform us that “whoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved;” ‡ and address themselves to the Christian world as to “those that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.” || But to what purpose is he invoked, unless he be omnipresent, and can in every place hear and answer,—omniscient, and can discern all our wants,—omnipotent, and therefore able to remove or prevent all the evils which we deprecate, and to bestow all the divine blessings which we supplicate?

5. The Apostles teach us to expect that he “shall change our vile bodies, and fashion them like unto his own glorious body.” How can he effect this, with power less than that which at first “created man out of the dust of the earth;” or unless he were “able to subdue even all things to himself?” §

6. The Apostles assert that it is he “who shall judge both the quick and the dead.” ¶ But how can he judge mankind, unless he have that power which God exclusively asserts, ** the power to search the human heart; unless he be “he that searcheth the heart and trieth the reins of the children of men, to give unto every one as his work shall be?” How can he judge between God and man, unless he know, what none but God can know,—the infinite perfections of the divine nature? Without this, how can he know what is due to those perfections, or what is due from them?

* Acts v. 31. † Eph. iv. 24. ‡ Rom. x. 13. || 1 Cor. i. 2.

§ Phil. iii. 21. ¶ 2 Tim. iv. 1. ** Jer. xvii. 10.

Thus is the Divinity of Jesus Christ everywhere interwoven with the apostolic system of doctrine.

But Mr. G. confidently affirms, that St. John, who “was left to censure whatever opinions arose contrary to those taught by Jesus and his Apostles,” * has censured none but those of the Gnostics who denied the *proper humanity of Jesus Christ*. The question of the true origin and character of the Ebionites, at whose errors also, both the Gospel and the first Epistle of St. John are generally supposed to have been levelled, we leave for the Ecclesiastical Historians to determine. On this subject the reader will do well to consult Bishop Horsley’s Letters to Dr. Priestley. Whatever the Ebionites were, St. John’s Gospel begins with the *eternity* and *Divinity* of the *Word*; which he asserts in such plain terms that Mr. G. is forced to concede, *pro tempore*, that “the Word was no other than God himself.” † As the pre-existence and Divinity of Jesus Christ are thus asserted in the beginning of that book, the proofs of those doctrines make up the substance of it. The Evangelist having thus asserted that the Eternal and Divine “Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us,” he subjoins, “And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.” ‡ He then proceeds to shew how his glory was seen, in all the testimonies concerning him, and in all his sayings and miracles, by which his Divine nature or his Divine perfections were manifested. All these, he professes, he wrote, “that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, *the Son of God*.” || This declaration of his purpose is immediately connected with the confession of faith which Thomas made, (My Lord and My God !) our Lord’s approbation of it, and his benediction on those who should believe, like him, on the testimony of his Apostles. It is true, a Socinian can see no Divinity implied in that phrase, “*the Son of God*.” When his prejudice is removed, he will see that St. John in his first Epistle, has not censured the Gnostics only, who denied our Lord’s humanity, but those also who denied his Messiahship and his Divinity. On the one hand he has indeed said, “Every spirit that confesseth not that

* Vol. II. p. 10. † Vol. I. p. 197. ‡ John i. 14. || John xx. 31.

Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, and this is that spirit of *antichrist*, whereof you have heard, that it should come.”* But, on the other hand, he has also said, “ Now are there *many antichrists*.—They went out from us,—that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us.—Who is a liar, but he that *denieth* that *Jesus* is the *Christ*? he is *antichrist* that denieth the *Father* and the *Son*.† “ Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God.‡—Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? ||—These things have I written unto you, [not merely to shew that Jesus Christ was a real man, but] that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.”§ And that this design might not be misinterpreted, he concludes that Epistle with these words, in which he declares the true Deity of the Son of God : “ We know that the *Son of God* is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the TRUE GOD, and eternal life.”¶

The Holy Spirit is never in the sacred scriptures denominated either a *person*, or *God the Holy Ghost*. Our Lord, however, in speaking of him, often gave him the strongest distinct and personal characters; and to his authority, on this subject, we have made our appeal. (See pp. 127, 128.) He also denominated the Holy Spirit, “ the Spirit of God,” (Matt. xii. 28.) and by that appellation indicated his proper Divinity. Now this is precisely the doctrine on which we insist.

On the whole : After Thomas had addressed Jesus Christ as his Lord and his God, and had been commended in the presence of his brethren for this confession of his faith, our Lord gave commandment to his disciples to “teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*.** This was the summit of what our Lord taught to his disciples, and this institution was a summary of the instruction which he had pre-

* 1 John iv. 3. † 1 John ii. 18—22. ‡ 1 John iv. 15. || 1 John v. 5.

§ 1 John v. 13. ¶ 1 John v. 20. ** Matt. xxviii. 19.

viously given to them. He did not say that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are *three*; but he did not make it *impiety* for us to *count* them. It was not necessary to teach that *three* are *three*. He did not say, “These three are *one* ;” or that the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost, is *God* ; but he appointed that, by a religious rite, the faithful shall be devoted to them, though he had also taught that “the Lord our *God* is *one Lord*, and that him *only* we should serve.”

According to this institution, by which the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*, are held forth as the *one* object of the *faith* and *obedience* of the Christian Church, the Apostles initiated every believer into this doctrine. And this doctrine, as well as the baptismal vow which was founded on it, they perpetuated by a form of benediction which is a counterpart of the form of baptism : “The grace of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, and the love of *God*, and the communion of the *Holy Ghost* be with you all.”

In this simple form, this great subject was left by Christ and his Apostles. It would be arrogance to suppose, that any addition which has been made to it is an improvement. The religious controversies of some of the first ages, introduced a phraseology to which the sacred writers, we find, were perfect strangers. Such an unscriptural phraseology, a Bible Christian might easily be persuaded to relinquish, if the sacrifice were to be made in favour of “the truth as it is in Jesus.” But the Socinians prohibit a recantation of the former, by identifying it with the latter; and almost vindicate the propriety of the phraseology, by using the same weapons against both. The cause of truth would not have stood on a firmer basis, if the technical terms of the schools had turned out to be those of Christ and his Apostles. To the word *Trinity* it would then be objected, that “it does not convey the idea of three *persons*.” To the phrase *Trinity in Unity*,—that “it may express a threefold distinction in one Being, very different from the personal distinction which Trinitarians maintain.” Had the Apostles spoken of *three persons in one God*, it would have been represented, “that these words, *literally* understood, suggest

a contradiction ; that *three persons* are *three beings* ; that *three beings* cannot subsist in *one being* ; and that, therefore, the language of the writer must be understood as ‘*highly figurative.*’” If the sacred writers had applied to *Jesus Christ* the scholastic appellation, “*God the Son,*”—it would have been very shrewdly observed, “that the word *Son* indicates a subordinate relation, and that therefore the phrase is a *denial*, rather than an *assertion*, of his supreme God-head.” And lastly, Had the phrase *God the Holy Ghost* been used in scripture, to any argument founded upon it it could easily have been answered, either (1.) “that this is a rhetorical figure, by which only the *abstract power, energy, or operation of God* is meant :” in proof of which the following passage would be cited, “the *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the *power of the Highest* shall overshadow thee.” Or, (2.) “that by this periphrasis, God simply is meant ; for “*God is a Spirit,*” and he is a *Holy Spirit.* ‘*By God the Holy Ghost, therefore, is meant, God who is a Holy Spirit.*’” At this rate, no terms of human invention will serve to silence a thorough Unitarian. But Mr. G. knows that, if the plain, direct, and obvious meaning of the sacred writers be allowed to be their true meaning, the doctrine of the preceding pages will want no scholastic terms for its support.

Having shewn that the language of sacred scripture is such as sufficiently accounts for the origin of the Trinitarian doctrines, it is not very necessary to seek their origin in the volumes of Ecclesiastical History. After this, to enter, with the Socinians, into a discussion of the opinions of the early Christians, cannot justly be demanded ; and, if not done with caution, would be to betray the cause of truth, by removing it from its proper foundation. In this discussion, the question is, What is the doctrine of the Old, and of the New Testament? The sacred writers lie open to all ; whereas the Christian Fathers are known to comparatively few. Hence, an appeal to the former may be generally considered in the light of an argument which carries conviction to every honest mind ; but an appeal to the latter is, in most cases, little better than a naked assertion, to ascertain

the truth of which the reader must depend on the judgment and integrity of the writer. The former are incomparably the best authorities. Their credit is justly established on the basis of divine inspiration; while that of the latter is often at the best but dubious. The first age of the Christian Church produced but few writers whose works have descended with unquestionable proof of their genuineness; and of those few none have written *professedly* on the subjects now under discussion. The consequence is, that little satisfaction is to be derived from their testimony; and every man feels himself at liberty to accommodate their language to his own pre-conceived opinion. This fact is confirmed by Mr. G.'s Lectures, in which, to prove, that the **MERE** humanity of Jesus Christ was maintained by them, he has been able only to cull a few passages such as the writings of any modern Trinitarian would plentifully afford, to prove that they believed his **PROPER** humanity: in which he has cited certain expressions indicative of the *distinction* and *relation* between the Father and the Son, such as Athanasius himself would not have rejected: * but in which he has exhibited, from those Fathers, nothing which has the most distant appearance of a denial of supreme Divinity to Jesus Christ. The few passages of those early writers, which give countenance to a doctrine on which they were not professedly writing, either are torn in pieces on the rack of criticism, or, because other passages of a similar kind have been interpolated, are cancelled as interpolations. If the scriptures themselves do not afford satisfactory evidence of the doctrines which they contain, the case is therefore desperate. When we descend to later ages, we meet with writers now on these subjects; but their testimony is not admitted, because they were not the immediate disciples of the Apostles. But if their testimony were admitted, and their scholastic terms were canonized, the men who can set aside the testimony of the Apostles, and make the more appropriate terms of Scripture speak their own language, can, with equal ease, enlist the metaphysical Fathers of the fourth

* The answers already given to his citations from scripture on the humanity of Christ, are equally applicable to those from the Christian Fathers.

century under the banner of Socinus, and convert the Nicene, and even the Athanasian creed into evidence in favour of their cause. But if we, on the other hand, could defend the doctrines of the Trinity by lucid and appropriate quotations drawn from the writings of all the Christian Fathers from Clement to Athanasius, unless we could prove them from Christ and his Apostles, all our authors must rank in the list of heretics.

These reasons for not resting the question on any but scriptural authority, may suffice. It is not designed, however, to insinuate that the primitive church was either Unitarian or neutral. While we distinguish between the words of human wisdom, and the truth of God, we may have sufficient proof that the primitive church was what we call *Trinitarian*.

Clemens, bishop of Rome, was an eminent Christian writer of the first century, and one who had conversed with the Apostles. Mr. G. has quoted from him the principal passages, among which are the following :—1. One in which he calls Jesus, *the Son of God*. “ Thus saith the Lord, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.”*—2. Another, in which, speaking of Jacob, he says, “ From him (sprang) the Lord Jesus *according to the flesh*:” † words which, without a Socinian comment, imply, that in another respect, Jesus Christ did *not* spring from Jacob. This scriptural phrase (*according to the flesh*) indicates that Jesus Christ was not merely human : for, (1.) Where is it applied, in a similar manner, to any mere man ? (2.) In the above passage, Clemens speaks of the Priests and Levites as springing from Jacob; but does *not* add, as in the case of our Lord, “ *according to the flesh*.” (3.) St. Paul has pointed out the true sense of this phrase in that *antithesis* in which he says, “ Jesus Christ was made of the seed of David, *according to the flesh*; but the Son of God, *according to the Spirit of holiness*.” ‡—3. A third, in which, speaking of Jesus Christ, he says, “ He came not in the pomp of pride and arrogance, *although he had it in his power*, but in humility.”—“ More ancient copies (those which Jerome used,) ”

* Vol. II. p. 47.

† Vol. II. p. 48.

‡ Rom. i. 3, 4.

instead of *καὶ τερπ δυναμένος*, ‘although he had in his power,’ had *καὶ τερπ πάντα δυναμένος*, ‘although he had *all things* in his power.’ The expressions clearly imply that, ere he came, he had *the power to choose*, and that *all things* were in his power :” * i. e. both his pre-existence and his omnipotence.

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, was a disciple and familiar friend of the Apostles. His short Epistles are replete with testimonies of the pre-existence and Divinity of Jesus Christ. It is not necessary for us to attempt a vindication of their genuineness against the cavils of Socinians. The reader may consult, on this subject, Dr. Horsley’s Letters to Dr. Priestley. If those Epistles are *not* genuine, they cannot be produced against us. If they are genuine, they are evidence in our favour. The following passages may suffice to illustrate their general tenor.—(1.) On the pre-existence of Christ. “ Who was with the Father *before all ages*, and appeared at the end of the world.” †—(2.) On the two-fold nature of Christ. “ Of the race of David *according to the flesh*, but the Son of God according to the will and power of God.” ‡—(3.) Of the Divinity of Christ. “ I glorify God, even Jesus Christ.” ||—(4.) Of the worship of Christ. “ Pray to Christ for me, that by the beasts I may be found a sacrifice to God.” §—(5.) Of the Trinity. “ Be ye strengthened in the concord of God, enjoying his inseparable Spirit which is Jesus Christ.” ¶

Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, was a disciple of St. John. In his Epistle to the Philippians, speaking of Jesus Christ, he says, “ Whom every living creature shall worship.” ** The following passage, in which he prays to Jesus Christ, and calls him *the Son of God*, (a term which, as we have shewn, indicated a Divine Person,) is quoted by Mr. G. : “ The Son of God, Jesus Christ, build you up in faith,” †† &c.—“ When he was at the stake, he finished his prayer with these words :—‘ For this, and for all other things, I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, by the eternal and heavenly High Priest, Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son ; with

* Horsley’s Letter, p. 131.

† Ad. Mag. sec. 5.

‡ Ad. Smyr. sec. 5.

|| Ad. Smyr. sec. 1.

§ Ad. Rom. sec. 4.

¶ Ad. Mag. sec. 13.

** Sect. 2.

†† Epis. to Phil. Sect. 12.

whom, to thee, and the Holy Spirit, be glory both now, and to all succeeding ages. Amen."*

Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, was a disciple of Polycarp. He says, "We shew that the *Word*, existing *in the beginning with God*, united himself *to the work of his own hands*, when he became a man capable of suffering :" †—Again: "To this purpose our Lord came to us, not so as he might have come, but so as we might be able to behold him; for he might have come to us *in his own unspeakable glory*, but we should not have been able to endure the magnitude of his glory. ‡—The scripture (says he) is full of the Son of God's appearing, sometimes to talk and eat with Abraham; at another time to seek Adam; at another time to bring down judgment upon Sodom; then again to direct Jacob in the way; and again to converse with Moses out of the bush. ||—The Father of our Lord Jesus manifests and reveals himself to all, to whom he is at all revealed, by his *Word* who is his *Son*. For they know the Father, to whomsoever the Son will reveal him. Now the Son, *co-existing always with the Father*, reveals the Father of old, even *always from the beginning*, to angels and archangels, and powers and dominions, and to men :" §—He adds, "Every knee should bow to Christ Jesus, our Lord and God, and Saviour and King, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father. ¶—The FATHER—by his own WORD and SPIRIT, makes, governs, and gives being to all things." **— "For his WORD and his WISDOM, the SON and the HOLY SPIRIT, are always with him; by whom, and with whom, he made all things freely, and of his own accord, to whom also he spake in these words, Let us make man in *our* image and likeness." ††

Justin Martyr, a Christian Apologist, wrote about the year 140. He says, "But the Son of the Father, even he who alone is properly called his Son, the Word which was with him before the creation, because by him he in the beginning made and disposed all things." †† &c.—And again :

* Martyr. of Polyc. sec. 14. † Lib. iii. cap. 20. ‡ Adv. Hæret. lib. iv. cap. 74.

|| Lib. iv. cap. 23.

§ Lib. ii. cap. 55.

¶ Lib. I cap. 2.

** Lib. i. cap. 22. sec. 1.

†† Lib. i. cap. 37.

†† Apol.

"But this Being who was really begotten of the Father, and proceeded from him, did, *before all creatures were made*, exist with the Father, and the Father *conversed with him.*"† Once more: "God, and his only-begotten Son, together with the Spirit, we worship and adore."‡

Athenagoras was another Christian Apologist, who wrote in the second century. Speaking of the Son, he says, "he is to the Father as the first offspring: *not as something made.* For God, being an eternal intelligence, himself from the beginning had the *Logos* in himself, being eternally rational."||

Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, was also a Writer, of the second century, in the defence of Christianity. Addressing himself to Autolycus, he says, "It was to no other that he said, '*Let us make,*' than to his own WORD, and to his own WISDOM." Again: "The three days which preceded the creation of the luminaries, were types of the Trinity, τριάδος; of GOD, and of his WORD, and of his WISDOM."§—The passage just quoted from Irenæus, shews that by "his WORD and his WISDOM," the writers of this age meant "the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT."

Clemens of Alexandria, an eminent writer of the second century, says, "*The Son of God*—is always every where, and contained no where: all mind, all light, all eye of his Father, beholding all things, hearing all things, knowing all things." And again: "Ignorance cannot affect GOD, him that was the FATHER'S COUNSELLOR before the foundation of the world."¶

Tertullian is the last writer of this century to whom we appeal. The following passage is translated from his Treatise *de Præscriptione*, by Dr. Priestley, and acknowledged by him to contain the Catholic Faith. The Rule of faith "by which we are taught to believe, that there is but ONE GOD, and this no other than the Maker of the world, who produced every thing out of nothing, by his own WORD then first sent down: that that Word was called his SON: that he appeared variously in the NAME of God, (i. e.

† Dial. cum Tryph. ‡ Apol. || Horsley's Letters, p. 59.

§ Ad Autolyc. p. 114. ¶ Stom. lib. vii. cap. 2.

being called *Jehovah*) to the Patriarchs: that he was afterwards conveyed, by the SPIRIT and power of God the Father, into the Virgin Mary: that he was made flesh in her womb, and from her appeared in the person of JESUS CHRIST.”*

That some should be dissatisfied with the terms *Trinity*, *Economy*, &c. which began to be invented and adopted in the times of Tertullian, as Mr. G., quoting that Author, has specified,† is not matter of wonder. The frequent discussion of these subjects led to the adoption of compendious terms and phrases, which, however proper, might easily give offence, especially as Theodosius the tanner of Byzantium was then preaching at Rome the Unitarian doctrine of the mere humanity of Jesus Christ.‡ We have not, however, undertaken to vindicate these scholastic terms, but the *scriptural truth*, with which, therefore, they are not to be identified.

* Remarks on Mr. Badcock’s Review, p. 18. † Vol. II. p. 76.

‡ Dr. Horsley to Dr. Priestley, Let. xiv. sec. 6.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the scriptural use of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

HOWEVER the prying curiosity of speculative minds may wish to extract from the scriptures a theory of the Trinity, the sacred books will afford them no satisfactory instruction on that mysterious subject, abstracted from its practical use. A careful perusal of the Old and the New Testament may soon convince the reader, that those books are intended to humble the pride of the human understanding, and to amend the heart. Let no one therefore imagine that his views of the subject are correct and scriptural, if he do not enter into the spirit and design of the sacred writers, and study the mysterious relation of the FATHER, the SON, and the HOLY SPIRIT, in the light of that practical use with which it is always connected, from which it can never, without detriment, be disjoined, and for the sake of which it is revealed. The following may serve to exemplify the use which the sacred writers make of it.

“God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” * To produce and “prepare a body” for the Son, “the HOLY SPIRIT came upon the virgin, and the power of the HIGHEST overshadowed her.” The SON obediently accepted the FATHER’s commission, and said, “A body hast thou prepared me. Lo, I come to do thy will, O God!” † He “came forth from the Father, and came into the world.” ‡ Thus, “when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.” ||

* John iii. 16. † Heb. x. 5, 7. ‡ John xvi. 28. || Gal. iv. 5, 6.

The FATHER acknowledged the SON, and while “the HOLY GHOST descended upon” the latter, “a voice came from heaven which said, Thou art *my Son*, in THEE I am well pleased.”* The attention of the human race was called, by the Father, to the Son, when a voice proceeded from the excellent glory, “This is my beloved Son, hear ye him.”†—It pleased the Father that in his dear Son should all fulness” of the Spirit “dwell.”‡ When therefore “the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten [Son] of the Father, full of grace and truth.”|| Anointed with all the fulness of the HOLY GHOST, the SON went forth, declaring to mankind the FATHER. He, whom God had sent, spake the words of God; for “God gave not the Spirit by measure to him.”§ The SPIRIT of the LORD (said he,) is upon ME, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor: he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord.”¶ Speaking the words of the Father, and delivering the Father’s commandments, the Son,** by the Spirit of God, wrought divine miracles, and confirmed the Father’s word, by doing the works of the Father; “that the Father might be glorified in the Son.—My Father worketh hitherto, (said he,) and I work.—The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For as the Father raiseth up the dead, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father; for he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father.”††

To “redeem us to God by his blood, the SON, by the eternal SPIRIT, offered himself without spot to God,”†† thus making “himself an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour:”||| And the FATHER by the

* Luk iii. 21, 22. † Luke ix. 35. ‡ Col. i. 19. || John i. 14.

§ John iii. 34. ¶ Luke iv. 18. ** John xii. 49. †† John v. 17—23.

†† Heb. ix. 14. ||| Eph. iv. 2.

SPIRIT (Rom. v. 24. viii. 11.) “raised the Son from the dead, for our justification.”

The FATHER “exalted the Son to his own right hand, and glorified him with his own self, with the glory which he had with him before the world was.”* The Son “ever liveth to make intercession, and is able to save to the uttermost all that come to God by him.”† He “prays the Father that he may give us another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth.”‡ He has ascended up on high, and received gifts for men, that the Lord God (by the Spirit) may dwell among them.|| “Behold I (says the Son) send [the Spirit] the promise of my Father upon you.—This Jesus hath God raised up. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this.”¶

“The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him authority to execute judgment also.** —God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.††—When therefore the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God,”†† and shall have pronounced the sentence of final acquittal, “Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you;” when the offering up of the nations shall be accepted, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost: when he shall have put all enemies under his feet;—he “shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, and the Son also himself shall be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.”|||

From the various combinations of this mysterious economy, all our blessings, but especially the blessings of our redemption and salvation, flow.

1. Mankind are ignorant of their Maker. “Verily he is a God who hideth himself. §§—No man hath seen God

* John xvii. 5. † Heb. vii. 26. ‡ John xiv. 17. || Psalm lxviii. 18.
 Eph. iv. 7, 8. § Luke xxiv. 49. ¶ Acts ii. 33. ** John v. 22, 27.
 †† Rom. ii. 16. ‡‡ 1 Thess. 1. 8. ||| 1 Cor. xv. 24—28. §§ Isa. xlvi. 15.

at any time; but the only-begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.*—No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son; and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.”† Again, on the other hand: “The things of God knoweth no man but the Spirit of God.”‡—No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the HOLY GHOST.||—But when the COMFORTER is come, (says the Son of God,) whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the SPIRIT of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me. §—I will pray the Father; and he shall give you another COMFORTER, even the SPIRIT of truth.—At that day, ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.”¶—When “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, gives unto them the SPIRIT of wisdom and revelation, in the knowledge of him, so that the eyes of their understanding may be enlightened;”** then they see the Son, who is the express image of the Father’s person, and “seeing the Son, they see the Father.”†† then they “know the Son, and know the Father also.”‡‡ Thus, “God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, shineth in their hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ:”||| And thus, “with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, they are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the SPIRIT of the Lord.”§§

2. “All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, ¶¶ and are by nature the children of wrath.”*** But the Son has, “by the grace of God, tasted death for every man.”†††—He was delivered [todeath] for our offences, and raised again from the dead, by the glory of the Father, for our justification.”†††—God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. ||||—By him we believe in God, who raised him up from the dead, that our faith and hope might be in God. §§§—Therefore being justified by faith, we have

* John i. 18.

† John xi. 27.

‡ 1 Cor. ii. 14.

|| 1 Cor. xii. 3.

§ John xv. 26.

¶ John xiv. 16, 20.

** Eph. i. 18.

†† John xiv. 9.

††† John xiv. 7.

||| 2 Cor. iv. 6.

§§ 2 Cor. iii. 18.

¶¶ Rom. iii. 23.

*** Eph. ii. 3.

††† Heb. ii. 9.

††† Rom. iv. 25, vi. 4.

|||| 2 Cor. v. 19.

§§§ 1 Pet. i. 21.

peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ ; and the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given to us.*—They are to the praise of his [the Father's] glory, who trust in Christ ; in whom, after having believed, they are sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise. †—They are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus ; and because they are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into their hearts, crying Abba, Father ! Wherefore they are no more servants, but sons ; and if sons, then heirs of God through Christ. ‡—The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to his abundant mercy, hath now begotten them again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away. ||—The God of hope fills them with all joy and peace in believing, that they may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost.” §

3. “Without Christ, mankind are without God in the world. ¶—If we draw nigh unto God, he will draw nigh to us. **—Now no man cometh unto the Father, but by the Son. ††—Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father. ‡‡—No man, however, can come to the Son, except the Father, who hath sent him, draw him :” ||| but drawn by the Father to the Son, “through him [the Son] we have an access by the Spirit unto the Father” §§—The Father communicates himself to us through the Son, and by the Holy Spirit. “By one Spirit, we are all baptized into one body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” ¶¶ Then are we the mystical “body of Christ, and members in particular. ***—The Father of glory hath made him [the Son] the head over all to the church, which is the body of him, [who is] the fulness of him that filleth all in all.” ††† Mystically united with this glorious head, in whom as his “dear Son, it pleased the Father that all fulness should dwell, ‡‡‡ of his fulness all we receive, and grace for grace.” |||| Now therefore, “There is one body,

* Rom. v. 1, 5. † Eph. i. 12, 13. ‡ Gal. iii. 26. iv. 6, 7. || 1 Pet. i. 3, 4.

§ Rom. xv. 13. ¶ Eph. ii. 12. ** James iv. 8. †† John xiv. 6.

‡‡ 1 John ii. 23. ||| John vi. 44. §§ Eph. ii. 18. ¶¶ I Cor. xii. 13.

*** 1 Cor. xii. 27. ††† Eph. i. 17, 22, 23. ‡‡‡ Col. i. 10. |||| John i. 16.

and one Spirit, even as we are called in one hope of our calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. *—Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ : †—to whom coming, as unto a living stone, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house. ‡—Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, on whom ye are builded together for an habitation of God, through the Spirit. ||—For this cause, (says St. Paul,) I bow my knees unto the Father of our **LORD JESUS CHRIST**, that he would grant you to be strengthened with might by the Spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith: that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend, with all saints, what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God. §—Our Fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ,” ¶ by the communion of that Spirit. “I will pray the Father, (says the Son,) and he shall give you the Spirit of truth; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. At that day, ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you. **—Thus, the grace of the **LORD JESUS CHRIST**, and the love of **GOD**, and the communion of the **HOLY GHOST**, are with us.” ††

Such is the manner in which the sacred writers have delivered to us the doctrine of the **TRINITY**. That doctrine is never abstracted from the plan of human redemption, but inextricably interwoven with it. As the foundation cannot be destroyed without the ruin of the whole superstructure, it is consistent enough in the Socinians, to attempt at once the destruction of the whole fabric.

* Eph. iv. 4—6. † 1 Cor. iii. 11. ‡ 1 Pet. i, 4, 5. || Eph. ii. 20, 22.
 § Eph. iii. 14—19. ¶ 1 John i. 3. ** John xiv. 16—20. †† 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

CHAPTER X.

Of the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Death of Jesus Christ.

To place this important subject on its proper basis, and to exhibit it in that light in which it appears in the book of revelation, we must consider the Old and the New Testament as the history of human redemption. The Old Testament was designed to suggest those ideas, and to establish those principles which should prepare the minds of God's people for the reception of that method of salvation which was to be more perfectly developed by the gospel of Jesus Christ. For this purpose its institutions were “*a shadow of good things to come*, but not the very image of the things.”*

That the legal institutions might answer this great and necessary end, the government erected in Israel was a *theocracy*. Jehovah was their chief Magistrate. “The Lord was their king: the Lord was their lawgiver; the Lord was their Judge.” Hence, when “the elders of Israel came to Samuel, and said, Make us a king to judge us like all the nations,—the LORD said unto Samuel, They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, *that I should not reign over them.*”†

As God was to them in the place of a secular king, he dwelt in the midst of them. “The Lord his God was with him, and the shout of a King was among them.”‡ The tabernacle was the place where he held his court, and the holy of holies was his pavilion. There the king of ISRAEL resided, and manifested his royal presence, by the Shechinah. There, as their Lawgiver, he was consulted; and, as their Judge, he administered justice.

* Heb. x. 1.

† 1 Sam. viii. 4, 7.

‡ Num. xxiii. 21.

He not only gave them *political* and *civil* laws, but also instituted a *ceremonial*, by which, in consideration of his dwelling among them, and to habituate them to a profound reverence for the presence of his truly gracious Majesty, he enforced on them an extraordinary degree of external purity. To preserve the honour of the Jewish ritual, and to promote the reverence which was due to Israel's king, the Priest and Levites were appointed as servants in waiting. Through them only, the people could have access to their Sovereign, and by them all their offerings were to be presented to him. Those offerings were of two kinds: some were *eucharistical*, and were offered in *acknowledgment* of *benefits* received; others were *piacular*, and were offered to *avert* impending *civil*, or to *regain* forfeited *blessings*. This is an important distinction, which is preserved through the whole of the Levitical law, and is particularly noticed by an apostle. “For every High Priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things [pertaining] to God, that he may offer both *gifts* and *sacrifices for sins*.” *

The *gifts* which the Apostle here mentions, were undoubtedly the *meat-offerings* the *drink-offerings*, the offering of the *first-fruits*, the *thank-offerings*, the *free-will-offerings*, and the *peace-offerings*. From these *gifts*, the “*sacrifices for sins*” are always to be particularly distinguished: as their nature and design were essentially different. And this difference renders that comparison which (for the sake of reducing the “*sin-offering*” to the standard of their own opinion,) the Socinians make between them, altogether inadmissible. No proof of what *was*, or what was *not*, the design of the “*gifts*,” can afford any decisive evidence concerning the design of the “*sacrifices for sin*.”

“A *sacrifice for sin* is a sacrifice to *expiate* the *guilt* of *sin*, in such a manner as to *avert* the *punishment* from the *offender*.” † Such were the *sin-offerings* instituted by the Levitical law.

The ceremonial enjoined by the King of Israel, was such that it was unavoidable in many cases that persons should, on account of some impurity, or the neglect of some of its

* Heb. v. 1.

† Magee.

ordinances, be excluded by it from the congregation, and from all its privileges. That impurity might be contracted by accident, ignorance, inattention, or natural or constitutional infirmity. A breach of the civil code was followed by the same consequences ; for, however as an offence against a brother it might be pardonable when restitution was made, as it was an offence against the legislator, the offender (as in the preceding case,) was not permitted to appear in the congregation, till the performance of certain expiations and ablutions. (See Lev. xvii. 20, 21.) In such cases, “all things under the law were purged with blood, and without shedding of blood was *no remission*.”* For these purposes, were appointed the various *sin-offerings*, by which, when the impure were absolved and purified, they were admitted into his courts, and their worship was accepted.

Of these sin-offerings the nature, occasion, and design, are fully exhibited in the Levitical law of sacrifices. The following passage, instead of many, will set this subject before the reader at one view.—“If the whole congregation of Israel sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly, and they have done [somewhat against] any of the commandments of the Lord, [concerning things] which should not be done, and are *guilty* ; when the sin, which they have sinned against it, is known, then the congregation shall offer a young bullock *for the sin*, and bring *him* before the tabernacle of the congregation. And the elders of the congregation shall *lay their hands upon the head of the bullock* before the **LORD** ; and the bullock shall be *killed* before the **Lord**. And the priest that is anointed shall bring of the bullock’s *blood* to the tabernacle of the congregation, and the priest shall dip his finger in [some] of the *blood*, and *sprinkle* it seven times before the **LORD**, even before the veil. And he shall put [some] of the *blood* upon the horns of the *altar* which is before the **LORD**, that is *in* the tabernacle of the congregation, and shall pour out *all the blood* at the bottom of the *altar of the burnt-offering*, which is *at the door* of the tabernacle of the congregation : And he shall take all his fat from him, and burn it upon the altar.

* Heb. ix. 22.

And he shall do with the bullock, as he did with the bullock for a *sin-offering*; so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an *atonement* for them, and *it shall be forgiven them*. And he shall carry forth the bullock without the camp, and burn him as he burned the first bullock: it is a *sin-offering* for the congregation.” *

Here we have a full account of the nature, occasion, design, and effect, of a *sin-offering*.

1. The *sin* of the congregation is so distinctly marked, that to write one sentence to convince the reader, that that *sin* is the *occasion* of the offering, and that *for* which it was offered, would be an insult on his understanding,

2. The Jewish lawgiver plainly says, “the *life* of the flesh is in the *blood*: and I have given it to you upon the *altar*, to make an *atonement* for your *souls*; for it is the *blood* that maketh an *atonement* for the soul.” † Now, in the preceding appointment of a sin-offering, it is particularly required that “the *blood* in which is the *life* of the flesh,” shall be sprinkled before the *Lord*, and put on the horns of the altar *within* the tabernacle,—that all the rest of the blood shall be poured out at the foot of the altar of burnt-offering,—and that thus an atonement shall be made, that the sin may be forgiven.

All this the Socinians will grant, if they may be permitted to put their own construction on the word *atonement*. What that construction is, Mr. G. will now inform us. “The word translated *atone*, (he says) signifies to cover, hide, conceal some blemish.” ‡ Very true:—and its application may be seen at once in those words, “Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose *sins* are *covered*:” by which is described “the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.” || An *atonement* is, therefore, that which, as it were, hideth the sin from him who is “of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.” This is its ideal meaning.—He proceeds: “With the meaning of *reconciliation*, the English word *atonement* perfectly accords. It is derived from the two words, *at one*, with the termination *ment*, *at-one-ment*. It signifies to bring together

* Lev. iv. 13—21. † Lev. xvii. 11. ‡ Vol. II. p. 143. || Rom. iv. 6, 7.

to terms of amity two persons that were before alienated from—each other. This is precisely the meaning of to *reconcile*.—In this *reconciliation* the change is *never* said to be in *God*, but always in *man*.”* We cannot, on this occasion, do justice to the subject without remarking: (1.) That Mr. G. has made a transition from the ideal meaning of the *original* word, to that of the *English*, and thus has relinquished the former: and (2.) That he has made pretty free with the meaning of words, when, proceeding by gradations, he assumes that the word *atonement*, as used in the Old Testament, perfectly accords with the word *reconciliation*. It is true they are sometimes, by a figure, as cause and effect, substituted for each other. Atonement is the *mean*, reconciliation the *end* effected by that mean. What is the nature of that reconciliation which is the effect of atonement, we will now enquire.

We are aware that in contradicting Mr. G.’s statement, it would sound rather harsh to say roundly, The change was in God. We acknowledge the immutability of the nature and perfections of God: but dare not attribute to him the immutability of a stone. Without any change in what he *is*, God can undoubtedly change in what he *does*. He can at one time be *angry* with us, and at another time *turn away* his anger. That as a secular governor, he did thus change when *atonement* was made, we prove thus:

(1.) It was not because God had offended the men, but because the men had offended God, that the sin-offering was to be offered. And because God was *offended*, God was to be *conciliated*.

(2.) It was not God who presented the sin-offering to the congregation: but the congregation who presented it to God. The offering was therefore made, not to “bring the men to terms of amity,” but to “bring” God “to terms of amity:” or, to speak with more propriety, it was the condition on which God proposed to be propitious to them.

(3.) In the case of *peace-offerings*, which were tokens of an existing *mutual* friendship, the offerer was allowed

* Vol. II. p. 146.

to eat a part of the offering, in the presence of the Lord. See Lev. vii. 11—19. But “no *sin-offering*, whereof any of the blood was brought into the tabernacle of the congregation, to reconcile withal in the holy place shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire.”* A clear proof that God in the holy place was to be conciliated by it; and not the men, who were not permitted to participate it.

(4.) When the congregation had sinned, God *permitted them not* to enjoy “the privileges of his peculiar people;” whereas when the sin-offering had been presented, he did *permit* them. In other words: The forgiveness was not on the part of the congregation; but God (as their secular governor) forgave their sin. “He shall make an *atonement* for them, and *it shall be forgiven* THEM.”

To this application of the word atonement, Mr. G. has, however, several objections which demand our attention.

(1.) The first to which we shall attend are those which are taken from the *persons* or *things* for which atonement is said to be made.

He thinks that *atonement* can only imply “a *consecration* or *dedication* to God,” because *atonement* is said to have been made “at the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the priest’s office; at the dedication of the Levites to their ministry; at the first act of worship, in which the people of Israel joined under the new high-priest; at solemn festivals; and as a voluntary donation.”†—He has quite forgotten that the Jews were not so “holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners,” but that the “High Priest needed daily to offer up sacrifice, FIRST *for his own sins*, and then for the *people’s*.‡ Let him prove that they had no sin to expiate, and then he may infer that these atonements were not for their sins.—As to the “*voluntary* donation,” Job offered burnt-offerings for his sons, because, said he, “It may be that my sons have sinned.”|| And why might not God allow a conscientious Jew, for a similar reason, to make a *voluntary* offering as an atonement? It is not clear, however, that the passage to which Mr. G. alludes, (Lev. i. 3)

* Lev. vi. 30. † Vol. II. p. 141. ‡ Heb. vii. 26, 27. || Job i. 5.

does speak of a *voluntary* atonement. The word is “*נִצְרָן*, *leretsono*,—to gain himself acceptance before the Lord. In this way all the versions appear to have understood the original words; and the connection in which they stand obviously requires this meaning.”*

But “a great part of the atonements had no reference to *character* whatever, but were appointed for things inanimate, as altars, tabernacles, &c.” †—This is some proof that an atonement was not made to conciliate that, *for* which it was made. How could an *altar* or *tabernacle* be conciliated? The truth is, that in atoning for the altar and the tabernacle, the atonement was made for the *people* who were to present *themselves* before the door of the latter, and their *offerings* on the former. Thus it was ordained that the High-priest “shall make atonement for the *holy place*, because of the *uncleanness of the children of Israel*, and because of *their transgressions* in all their sins: and so shall he do for the *tabernacle* of the congregation that remaineth among them in the midst of *their uncleanness*.” ‡

(2.) The second class of objections are taken from the *nature* of the sins for which atonement was made. “The term *atonement* is used in reference to bodily diseases and infirmities, the commission of sins of ignorance, and only in two cases are sacrificial atonements appointed to be made for wilful violations of the moral law.” ||

That is, in plain terms, the legal atonements were not made for transgressions of the universal law of righteousness, but for transgressions of some of the *ceremonial* and *civil* laws, which God had given to them as their chief Magistrate. The impurities contracted by certain “diseases, and infirmities,” and the “sins of ignorance,” were transgressions of the *ceremonial* law. The former were considered as attendants on some sin, and were in fact the consequences of the fallen state of human nature. The latter were sins committed in the misapplication of the sacred things through *avoidable* ignorance. The “wilful violations” for which atonements were appointed, were cases of “dishonest deal-

* Dr. A. Clarke in loc.

† Vol. II. p. 143.

‡ Lev. xvi. 16.

|| Vol. II. p. 141, 142.

ing," and "the treatment of slaves," which were breaches of the *civil* law. They all referred to the Jewish polity, and the atonement was made to restore the man to the privileges of that polity which, by these transgressions, they forfeited. It was an atonement suited to the nature of the sin, of the evils to be averted, and of the benefits to be recovered. But still it was an *atonement for sin*. In the case of dishonest dealing, the dishonest person was obliged, first, to make an atonement to the man whom he had injured, by restoring the property embezzled, and one fifth part more; and then to make also an atonement to the legislator, whose laws he had wilfully violated.

(3.) The third class of objections are taken from the *effect* of the atonement to be made. "The atonement only referred to *religious privileges*." *

Mr. G. might have said *civil* and *religious* privileges; for the civil and ritual law were blended together. There is some truth in this. The sins for which atonement was made, were such as excluded the sinner from the congregation of Israel, and, if not atoned when known, procured a sentence of *anathema*. This sentence was revoked when the proper atonement was made; and the person previously deemed "*guilty*," was now "*forgiven*," and was admitted to the peculiar privileges which he had forfeited. But still the atonement is always called an atonement for his *sin*.

(4.) The fourth class of objections are taken from those passages which declare, that sacrifices could not supply the place of repentance, reformation, and obedience. "Thou desirest not sacrifice; thou delightest not in burnt-offerings; the sacrifice of God is a broken spirit," &c.&c. †

The question is not, "Would the Jewish sacrifices stand instead of morality and piety, or of repentance and reformation?" but, "Were they appointed for the ceremonial expiation of certain sins, of a penitent sinner, against the Jewish law?" We have found that they were.

3. In order, however, that the sin-offering by which atonement was made, might be effectual to procure the forgiveness of the sin for which it was offered, the sinner must *confess* his sin, and *acknowledge* the sacrifice as *his own*, and

* Vol. II. p. 143.

† Vol. II. p. 147.

that he offered it as an atonement for his sin.—The confession of his sin is sometimes mentioned. “ He shall *confess* that he hath *sinned* in that thing ; and he shall *bring his trespass-offering* unto the Lord.” * See Num. v. 7. This is also particularly enjoined on the great day of atonement, and the meaning of it is distinctly stated. “ And Aaron [as the representative of all the people,] shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live-goat, and *confess* over him *all the iniquities* of the children of Israel, and *all their transgressions* in *all their sins*, *putting them upon the head of the goat.*” † In the passage more immediately under consideration, as well as in the institution of sin-offerings in general, the offerers were required, either personally or by their representatives, to “ bring” the victim “ before the tabernacle of the congregation,” and to “ lay their hands upon its head before the Lord.” By this act they designated it as *their* offering to make atonement for their sin : and their sin was consequently forgiven.

As this economy was intended to adumbrate the dispensation of the gospel, the principles on which it was founded, and the doctrines which it holds forth, are to be applied for the illustration of our subject : these being the *shadows*, of which Christ is the *substance*.

In the Christian economy, and under the government of HIM who is a great king in all the earth, Jesus Christ is ordained “ the High-priest of our profession.” ‡ In him we have one infinitely greater than Aaron or his sons. “ We have a great High-priest, that is passed into [or through] the heavens, Jesus the Son of God.||—We have such an High-priest, who is set on the throne of the Majesty in the heavens, a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man.§—For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* of the *true* ; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.¶—And no man cometh to the Father but by him.” **

* Lev. v. 5. † Lev. xvi. 21. ‡ Heb. iii. 2. || Heb. iv. 14. § Heb. viii. 1, 2.

¶ Heb. ix. 24. ** John xiv. 6.

As “every High-priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices, it is of necessity that this man have somewhat to offer.” The Priests who “offered gifts according to the law, served only unto the example and shadow of heavenly things.—But now hath HE obtained a *more excellent ministry*, by how much also he is the mediator of a *better covenant*, which is established upon *better promises*. *—The way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: which was a *figure for the time then present*, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience.—But Christ being come an High-priest of good things to come, by a *greater and more perfect tabernacle*, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building: neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having *obtained eternal redemption for us.*” †

In these interesting passages the reader will perceive a continued comparison between the priesthood, ministry, and sacrifices of the Jewish institution, and those of Jesus Christ: the design of which is to shew, that the former was figurative of the latter, and that the latter resembles, but infinitely excels, the former.

The oblations of the Jewish high-priest, we have found, were “gifts and sacrifices for sins.” That which our great High-Priest offered was of the latter kind, a sin-offering; as is sufficiently obvious from the following passages. “When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin. ‡—He hath made him to be *αμαρτίαν*, a *sin-offering* for us. || “Who needeth not daily, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people’s: for this he did once when he offered up himself. §—Now once he hath appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. ¶—Christ was once offered to bear the *sins* of many. **—But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, &c. ††—And there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.” ‡‡

What then is the meaning of these phrases? Mr. G. explains them thus:—“In every sacrifice, the victim is sup-

* Heb. viii. 3—6. † Heb. ix. 8—12. ‡ Isa. liii. 10. || 2 Cor. v. 21.

§ Heb. vii. 27. ¶ Heb. ix. 25. ** Heb. ix. 28. †† Heb. x. 12. ‡‡ Heb. x. 26.

posed to die for the good and benefit [not for the *sins*, it seems,] of the persons on whose account it is offered; so Christ dying in the cause of virtue, and to bestow the greatest of all blessings upon the human race, a proof of a future state, is beautifully represented as having given his life a sacrifice for us. The resemblance between *the death of Christ*, according to this account of the nature and object of it, and the *sin-offerings* spoken of in the Old Testament, appears to me to be a sufficient foundation for its being called by that name, and would abundantly justify the metaphor," &c.* What striking resemblance Mr. G. sees between a *martyr* dying in the cause of *virtue* and a *victim* bleeding for *sin*; or between an animal which died and *was no more*, and a person who died to *give a proof of a future state* by his *resurrection*,—we confess our inability to conjecture. If the advocates of proper atonement were obliged to interpret the scriptures which relate to that subject in this vague manner, and could give no more rational or scriptural proof of the justness of their opinions, than is contained in this unmeaning cant of Mr. G., and the editor of the Theological Repository, how would the Socinians triumph! But leaving this explanation to its unavoidable fate, we appeal to the scriptures, in proof, that the application of the phrase, "saerifice for sin," to the death of Christ, is not a "metaphor," as Mr. G. calls it, in which all discernible analogy is lost; but that in all the circumstances essential to a *sin-offering*, that of Jesus Christ agrees with those which were offered under the law.

1. We have seen, that the saerifices for sins were offered, by the Jewish priests, on account of the sins of the people. The following passages will distinctly shew that Jesus Christ offered up himself for the sins of mankind. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities.—All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.—For the transgression of my people was he stricken.—He shall bear their iniquities.—He hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was num-

* Vol. II. p. 148.

bered with the transgressors : and he bare the sin of many.* —Who was delivered for *our offences*. †—I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures. ‡—Who gave himself for our sins. ||—Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” §

2. The Jewish sin-offerings made an atonement for the persons for whom they were offered, in consequence of which their sins were forgiven. (See page 177.)—It has been remarked that the *blood*, which is the life, is that which made *atonement* for the soul. Now, as under the law the blood of the victim was shed, so the “ blood of Christ was shed for many, for the remission of sins,” ¶ and as in the former case the High Priest went into the most holy place with the “ blood which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people,” ** so “ Christ, by his own blood, entered once into the holy place (not made with hands) having obtained eternal redemption for us.” †† Thus, as the Jewish High Priest made atonement, by the shedding and sprinkling of blood, Jesus Christ has made atonement by the shedding and “ sprinkling” of his blood.

The words used on this subject, by the sacred writers, are the same which are used by the LXX. viz. the derivatives of *λαω*, I am *propitious*. Those interpreters render Lev. iv. 20, 26, 35, &c. “ the priest shall *make atonement*,” by *εξιλασσεται*. In Ezek. xliv. 27, where it is said “ the priest shall bring his *sin offering*,” they use the word *λασμον*.—Thus, in like manner, the prophet Daniel, predicting the death of the Messiah, declares it to be one part of the design of it, according to the LXX. *εξιλασσθαι*, to *make atonement* or propitiation for iniquity. ‡‡ The Apostle to the Hebrews says, “ It behoved Christ as our “ *merciful* High Priest, *λαυκεσθαι*, to make *atonement* or *propitiuation* for the sins of the people.” |||| Henee Jesus Christ is said to be a propitiation or atonement for our sins. “ God loved us, and sent his Son *λασμον*, a *propitiuation* or *atonement* for our sins.” §§

* Isa. liii. 5, 6, 8, 11, 12. † Rom. iv. 25. ¶ 1 Cor. xv. 3. || Gal. i. 4.
 § 1 Pet. ii. 24. ¶ Matt. xxvi. 28. ** Heb. ix. 7. †† Heb. ix. 12.
 ‡‡ Dan. ix. 21. |||| Heb. ii. 17. §§ 1 John iv. 10.

"If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is *ιλασμός*, the *propitiation* or atonement for our sins." *—In his unguarded effort to get rid of this word, (Vol. II. p. 151,) Mr. G. has confounded it with *ιλαστηρίου*, which means a *propitiatory*. It is not improbable that St. Paul meant by it a *propitiatory sacrifice*. But we found no argument upon it, because, though it cannot be disproved, it may be disputed. To serve an hypothesis, Mr. G. translates it, "a mercy-seat." But this shifting of the terms destroys his argument. † The Reader will do well to keep in mind that the one proper word, which in the original means *propitiation* or *atonement*, remains unanswered, and is unanswerable.

The purpose of atonement or propitiation, is *reconciliation*. It is not denied, but asserted by Mr. G., that "we are reconciled to God by the death of his Son." ‡ "But in this reconciliation, (he says) the change is never said to be in God, but always in man." || The phrase, "to be reconciled to God," is certainly ambiguous, and may be interpreted as meaning either to be conciliated by him, or to be admitted to his friendship. It becomes, therefore, an important question, What is the sense in which it is used in the scriptures?

When the Philistines suspected that David, who was then with them, would appease the anger of Saul by be-

* 1 John ii. 2.

† Dr. Priestley, in the conclusion of his History of the Doctrine of Atonement, has explicitly granted that the Socinians had not yet been able "to explain all particular expressions in the apostolical epistles, &c. in a manner perfectly consistent with (what they deem) the general strain of their own writings." Hist. of Cor. Vol. I. p. 280. It would have been candid to have told the public which are all those "particular expressions." The word *ιλασμός*, *propitiation*, seems to be one of them, which therefore he has passed over by just observing that 1 John ii. 2. and iv. 10. "are the only places in which the word *propitiation* *ιλασμός*, occurs in the New Testament." P. 183. He had overlooked the prophecy of Daniel and the epistle to the Hebrews. This one word was too hard for him: and well it might, for it is directly to the point. But Mr. G. is a little more hardy, and ventures (since Dr. Priestley could not "explain" this "particular expression in the apostolic epistles without any effort or straining,") to make a mighty "effort," and to "strain" very much to explain it according to his own hypothesis. But his "straining effort" tends only to his own discomfiture.

‡ Vol. II. p. 144. Rom. v. 10.

|| Vol. II. p. 146.

coming their adversary, they said, “ Wherewith should he *reconcile himself unto his Master?* should it not be with the heads of these men? ”* Here, to *reconcile one's self to another*, is obviously to *appease his wrath*, or *conciliate his favour*.—“ If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath *aught against thee*,—first be *reconciled to thy brother*. ”† Here, the case is that of a brother offended; and to be *reconciled* to him, is to *appease* or *conciliate him*.—The next passage is still more in point, because it refers to the ease in hand.—“ God was in Christ, *reconciling the world to himself, not imputing to them their trespasses*. ”‡ Here, for God to *reconcile* the world *to himself*, is to *forgive* their *trespasses*.—From these passages, the meaning of the phrase is plain, and no ambiguity remains.—It is in this sense, “ we are reconciled to God, by the death of his Son.” ||

The effect of the Jewish atonements was, that the sins of the persons for whom they were offered, were forgiven. (See p. 179.) Such precisely is the consequence of the death of Christ, as the following passages will sufficiently prove.—“ My righteous servant shall justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities. §—This is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. ¶ We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins.” ** See also Col. i. 14. “ Being now justified by his blood.” †† Thus, “ God, *for Christ's sake*, (says St. Paul) hath forgiven you.” ‡‡

3. The benefit of the sin-offering was appropriated by the person for whom an atonement was to be made, by his *confession* of his *sin*, and his *acknowledgment* of the *sacrifice* as offered *for him*. Just so, to appropriate the benefit of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, it is necessary that men should confess their sin with a penitent heart, and depend on the propitiation which he has made. He that thus appropriates the benefit of his sacrifice, obtains mercy. “ If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive our sins,

* I Sam. xxix. 4.

† Matt. v. 23, 24.

‡ 2 Cor. v. 13.

|| Rom. v. 10.

§ Isa. liii. 11.

¶ Matt. xxvi. 28.

** Eph. i. 7.

†† Rom. v. 9.

‡‡ Eph. iv. 32.

and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. *—All have sinned and come short of the glory of God : being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ ; whom God hath set forth a propitiatory through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past—that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.” †

Thus we find that between the Levitical sacrifices and the great Christian Sacrifice, the resemblance is exact and striking; and that the latter answers to the former, as the antitype to its typical representative. Whatever there is of difference between them, consists chiefly in the superiority of the Christian atonement, the consideration of which will greatly confirm the truths which have been stated.

The Jewish sacrifices were but “*a shadow of good things to come :*” the Christian sacrifice is the “*substance.*” Those were offered for mere ceremonial or *civil* purposes : *this* for *moral* guilt and pollution. Those were mere animals: CHRIST “offered up himself.” “It was impossible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins ;” but Jesus has “put away sin by the sacrifice of himself :” ‡ The former “could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience :” || but “the blood of Christ, who by the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, can purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. §—The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, could only sanctify to the purifying of the flesh,” ¶ and therefore only gained admission into the *visible* tabernacle ; but we, “having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience,—have boldness to enter into the *holiest* by the blood of Jesus.” **—Every [Levitical] Priest stood daily in the temple, offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But THIS MAN, after he had offered *one* sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God ; for by *one offering*, he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.” — And therefore, “where remission of sins is,

* 1 John i. 9. † Rom. v. 23, 26. ‡ Heb. x. 4. ix. 26. || Heb. ix. 9.

§ Heb. ix. 14. ¶ Heb. ix. 13. ** Heb. x. 19, 22.

[such as *he* has obtained] there is no more offering for sins." *

To this statement, Mr. G. finds many objections, against which we must vindicate it.

1. "The term *priest*, is applied to Christians in general," † who are said to offer themselves or other gifts as sacrifices. ‡ " If (these terms) prove an atonement, then the atonement is in part effected by all Christians." ||

The short answer is, that "Christians in general" are not denominated "High-Priests," nor their sacrifices "propitiatory," or "sacrifices for *sin*." Their sacrifices are *eucharistic* sacrifices, or *thank*-offerings. "I beseech you by the *mercies* of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice." § Again : "Let us offer the sacrifice of *praise* to God continually, that is, the *fruit of our lips*, giving *thanks* to his name." ¶ In offering these sacrifices, "Christians in general" act as priests. "Ye also [are] an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices." ** The priesthood of "Christians in general" is, however, subordinate, and acceptable only through the peculiar and peerless priesthood of Jesus Christ. "By him (says the Apostle) let us offer the sacrifice of *praise* to God." †† And again : Our "spiritual sacrifices are acceptable to God, [only] by Jesus Christ." ‡‡ We have therefore but one Great High-Priest, the Son of God ; and "there remaineth *no more sacrifice for sin*," since "by one offering HE hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

2. But "Jesus Christ is said to have been a *curse* for us." "A *curse*, (says Mr. G.) and an *acceptable sacrifice*, are totally inconsistent. For to render a sacrifice acceptable, it was absolutely requisite that it should be pure." ||||

Mr. G. has only taken for granted, that to be "made a *curse*," and to be *impure*, are identically the same. Does he mean to assert that Jesus Christ's "hanging on a tree" was a "*blemish*" on his moral character ?

* Heb. x. 11, 12, 11, 18.

† Vol. II. p. 146.

‡ Vol. II. p. 149.

|| Vol. II. p. 146.

§ Rom. xiii. 1.

¶ Heb. xiii. 15.

** 1 Pet. ii. 5. †† Heb. xiii. 15.

‡‡ 1 Pet. ii. 5.

||| Vol. II. p. 150, 152.

3. “Again: Christ was a *priest*, a *victim*, and the *mercy-seat*.—How are these things to be reconciled, if all are to be taken literally?” *

He was both the *priest* and the *victim*, by “offering up himself.” But the word *ἀλατηρίον* (Rom. iii. 25.) is not properly “a mercy-seat,” but a *propitiatory*. The *mercy-seat* was called *ἀλατηρίον*, a *propitiatory*, because there the blood of atonement was sprinkled, in consequence of which, God, who was supposed to sit on the *mercy-seat*, was *propitious*. Through the atoning blood of Christ, God is *propitious* to us; and therefore Christ also may be called *ἀλατηρίον*, a *propitiatory*. “God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing to them their trespasses.”

Before this subject is dismissed, a train of important reflections, arising out of the preceding observations, demand the Reader’s most serious attention.—The immolation of victims for the expiation of sin, is justly supposed to have been originally of divine institution. When God taught our first parents to clothe themselves with the skins of beasts, he undoubtedly taught them first to slay those beasts that were to be flayed, certainly not for *food*, and therefore most probably in *sacrifice*. The proof that Abel offered a sacrifice to God, is, however, much more clear and positive: and the *respect* which God had to *his* offering, makes it nearly certain that it was presented according to a previous divine appointment. Abel could not know that the life of an unoffending animal would be an acceptable offering, so as to offer it, as it is said he did, by *faith*, unless he had first received some intimation of it from above: for “*faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*” † In the days of Noah, it is still more obvious, from the distinction then observed between clean and unclean animals, the more ample provision which was made of the former, the offering which he made of them, and the grateful acceptance of that offering,—that sacrifice made an important part of the institution of religious worship. (Gen. vii. and viii.) The sacrifices which Abram offered, were, we are assured,

* Vol. II. p. 153.

† Rom. x 17.

of divine appointment. (Gen. xv. 9.) When the wrath of God was kindled against the friends of Job, God said, “Take unto you seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering ; and my servant Job shall pray for you; for him will I accept, lest I deal with you after your folly.”*—These divine institutions were, under the Levitical dispensation, made, by the same authority, the basis of a more extended and particular sacrificial institution, which agreed in every respect with that which preceeded, both as to the quality of the sacrifices to be offered, and the manner of offering them. This agreement is a confirmation of the divine authority of the former. The extension of the law of sacrifice, we learn from the inspired writers, was intended to be a more perfect figure of good things to come. No human invention, no common transaction of mankind with each other, was sufficient to elucidate the method of salvation by Jesus Christ. The relations of mankind to each other, differ widely from the relations which exist between God and his creatures : Nothing, therefore, but transactions between God and men, can properly illustrate transactions between God and men. Hence HE, who alone was acquainted with “the mystery of his will which he had purposed in himself,” adapted all the circumstances of these institutions to this one great purpose. Hence the Apostles, when treating on the grand topic of their ministry, “CHRIST CRUCIFIED,” derive their principal ideas and phrases from this preceding economy, and make the institutions of the Patriarchal and Mosaic ages a key to the new dispensation. The sacrifices for sin, which were offered from the primitive times according to the divine appointment, and were regulated by the wisdom of HIM who knew the end from the beginning, are the volume from which they derive their most luminous lessons of instruction. And what shall we infer from this, but that God has intended, by the whole sacrificial code, to give to mankind the most just and the most appropriate ideas of the sacrifice and propitiation of

* Job xlii. 1.—A most important illustration of the *design* of sacrifices as well as of their *divine institution*.

"the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world ;" —that his own previous institutions are an infallible guide to our understanding : and that every allusion which is made to *mere human affairs*, is very *imperfect*, and neither can be, nor ought to be, applied in the same *unqualified* manner, for the illustration of the objects of the death of Christ ?

The Divine Author of revelation has, however, been pleased, for our instruction on this most important subject, to introduce allusions to the ordinary transactions of mankind with each other. Among these, the terms of emancipation, as *redemption*, *ransom*, with others of the same class, hold a conspicuous place.

With the Socinians it is a common practice, to insist that scriptural terms be always interpreted in the same sense : and while they themselves are often completely at a loss to affix to a word such a meaning as will admit of an universal application, they are perpetually bawling for *consistency*. They have, however, *prudence* enough not to try whether the meaning which they prefer, will bear them out in their imaginary consistency, without leading them into the most glaring absurdities.

That the terms already alluded to, are sometimes used by the sacred writers *improperly*, we do not deny. To *redeem*, or to *ransom*, is, as Mr. G. says, "to buy again." * Now the proper mean of redemption is a *price*: and that price is a *ransom*. But the scriptures sometimes speak of a *thing* being "bought without money and without price ;" and of a *people* being "redeemed without money." Thus God paid no price for the redemption of Israel out of Egypt. Every man of common sense sees, that this is what Rhetoricians call, in their technical sense, an *impropriety* in speech ; and that the impropriety is marked by the terms, "without price." Mr. G. takes for granted that the *same terms* must always be used in the same improper sense. If it should appear, however, that the scriptures often make specific mention of the *price* by which redemption is accomplished, it will be obvious, that the terms in question are often used *properly*: and if this proper way of speaking be

* Vol. II. p. 136.

found to be applied to our redemption by Jesus Christ, it will follow that the scriptural idea of our redemption by his death, is that of a redemption by price.

The word *redemption* is often used in the Old Testament, in such a manner as can only be interpreted of a *price paid*: and sometimes that price is particularly specified. For instance; “If thy brother sell himself unto the stranger, after that he is sold he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren may redeem him.—And he shall reckon with him that bought him, from the year that he was sold to him, unto the year of jubilee: and the *price* of his sale shall be according unto the number of years. If there be yet many years behind, according unto them he shall give again the price of his redemption, out of the *money* that he was bought for.” See Lev. xxv. 47—52. Ex. xiii. 13, 15. Lev. xxv. 25. xxvii. 13, 15, 20. Ruth iv. 4. Num. xviii. 15. &c. &c.

The word *ransom* is used in the same manner. “If there be laid on him a *sum of money*, then he shall give, for the *ransom* of his life, *whatsoever is laid upon him*.” Exod. xxi. 30. See also Psalm xlix. 7. Prov. vi. 35. xxi. 18. Isa. xlivi. 3. &c. &c.

The use made of these terms, when, in the New Testament, they are applied to the death of Christ, is exactly similar to that already examined. It is true indeed that the word *redemption*, is *sometimes* used in a different sense. Thus we read—of “the redemption of our body; *—of the day of redemption;” †—and of “Christ who of God is made unto us redemption.” ‡ In these passages, no price is alluded to: our bodies especially are said to be “redeemed from death,” to be “ransomed from the power of the grave,” by the *power* of him who “is able to subdue all things to himself;” But not without a previous *redemption* by *price*.

This last is most frequently meant, when we are said to be redeemed by Jesus Christ. Thus:—“Ye are bought with a price. ||—Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from

* Rom. viii. 23.

† Eph. iv. 30.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 30.

|| 1 Cor. vi. 20.

your vain conversation ;—but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. * —Who gave himself [as the *price*] for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity. †—Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood. ‡—We have redemption through his blood, the *forgiveness of sins.*” ||—According to the doctrine of these passages, we are redeemed, or bought back, by a price ;—that price is the precious blood of Christ ;—and *the forgiveness of sins* is the effect of our being so redeemed.

The meaning of the word, *ransom*, is the same as a *price of redemption*, and is applied to the death of Christ, precisely as we apply it to the *price* paid for the *redemption of a captive*. “The Son of man came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to *give his life* a *ransom* for many. §—There is one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus ; who *gave himself* a *ransom* for all.” ¶||

The second order of terms taken from the transactions of mankind with each other, for the illustration of this subject, are *judicial*. In the examination of these, Mr. G. will render us some assistance.

“The Almighty is described as a JUDGE, taking cognizance of the behaviour of mankind, and enquiring how far their actions had accorded with the laws which he had given to man. The trial could not but have the most unfavourable issue.” ** “What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law ; that *every mouth* may be stopped, and *all the world* may become guilty before God. (Therefore by the deeds of the law no flesh is *justified* in his sight : for by the law is the knowledge of sin.)” †† But the sinner whose “mouth is stopped,” and who cannot put in a plea of “*not guilty*,” “has an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.” ‡‡ An advocate, as Mr. G. grants, is one who “makes intercession.” |||| As an Advocate then, Jesus Christ “ever liveth to make intercession

* 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. † Tit. ii. 14. ‡ Rev. v. 9. || Col. i. 14. Eph. i. 7.

§ Matt. xx. 28. Mark x. 45. ¶ 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. ** Vol. II. p. 166.

†† Rom. iii. 19, 20. ‡‡ 1 John ii. 1. ||| Vol. II. p. 169.

for us."* An Advocate, or Intercessor, is one who *pleads the cause* of another. Here again Mr. G. comes forward, in his usual style, demanding the same uniform application of the same terms. According to him, because God is sometimes said to *plead* in behalf of a people by delivering them, or against them by punishing them, the same expressions must always be interpreted in the same manner.† It has been often repeated, that the occasional *improper* use of any phrase is no argument that *that* phrase is always used in the same sense. When Mr. G. has put his own interpretation on the passages he has cited, and shewn how "the Almighty is spoken of as *pleading* a cause," ‡ he will not be able to adapt the same interpretation to the following passages:— "O that one might plead for a man with God, as a man pleadeth for his neighbour!—Hear now my reasoning, and hearken to the pleadings of my lips." || Nor will his explication of the pleadings of the Almighty, serve to neutralize the intercession of Christ, our Advocate with the Father. In vain does he inform us that an "Intercessor is *merely* one who acts as a medium between two parties:" or that the word *intercession* "is synonymous with *mediation*."§ All this may be true: but the mediation of Jesus Christ is exercised not only with men in *behalf of God*, but with God in *behalf of men*. "He is *our* Advocate with the Father. He ever liveth to make intercession *for us*." And will any Socinian be hardy enough to speak out, and to say that as God Almighty pleads for his people, by executing judgment on their enemies with whom he pleads, so Jesus Christ pleads for a sinner by executing judgment on him with whom he pleads? One would hope that even a "*rational Divine*" would shrink from such blasphemy.

But if "Jesus Christ the righteous" be properly our "Advocate with the Father," he must have some *plea* to put in, in behalf of him whose "mouth is stopped," and who stands "guilty before God." He cannot advocate his cause by pleading his innocence. What he does plead, we

* Heb. vii. 25.

† Vol. II. p. 170.

‡ Vol. II. p. 170.

|| Job xiii. 6. xvi. 21

§ Vol. II. p. 170.

learn from the authority by which we are assured that he is our Advocate. “If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our’s only, but also for the sins of the whole world.”*—There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all.†—For this cause he is the Mediator of the new covenant, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.‡—He is able to save to the uttermost them that come to God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such an High Priest [an intercessor] became us—who needeth not daily to offer up sacrifice—for this he did once when he offered up himself.”|| Thus we see that the mediation, advocacy, or intercession of Christ, is uniformly connected with the sacrifice which he has offered, the propitiation which he has made, the ransom which he has paid: in a word, with his death for our transgressions. This therefore is the ground of his intercession, and the plea which he urges as our Advocate. “He bare the sin of many, and makes intercession for the transgressors.”§

This doctrine is best illustrated by the Levitical law, under which “the High Priest alone [as the advocate of the people] entered into the second tabernacle once every year, *not without blood*, which he offered for the errors of the people.”¶

In this light we are to consider those scriptural expressions concerning Christ dying for our sins. ** “The wages

* 1 John ii. 1, 2.

|| Heb. vii. 25—27.

† 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.

§ Isa. liii. 12.

‡ Heb. ix. 15.

¶ Heb. ix. 7.

** We have not quoted here those scriptures which speak of the Saviour *dying for men*. Such are Rom. v. 6, 8. xiv. 15. 1 Cor. viii. 11. 2 Cor. v. 15. Gal. ii. 20. 1 Thess. v. 10. The reason for this omission is, that these scriptures come under the class of the terms of *emancipation*. He “gave himself *for us*, that he might *redeem us*.”—“Christ hath *redeemed us* from the curse of the law, being made a curse [dying a death pronounced accursed] *for us*; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” Gal. iii. 13. He gave “*his life a ransom for many*.” In all these passages, therefore, Christ is considered as having *given himself a price* for us. The scriptures quoted above belong to the class of *judicial* terms. In them Jesus Christ is considered as having *borne a penalty* in lieu of that which mankind have incurred.—The ideal meaning of these two classes of terms, is therefore somewhat different, though their doctrinal meaning is precisely the same.

of sin is *death*.^{*} That punishment he is represented as having *borne for us*. “Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows : he was wounded for our transgressions ; he was bruised for our iniquities : the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, and turned every one to his own way ; and the Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all. For the transgression of my people was he stricken. He hath poured out his soul unto death : and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors. †—Who was delivered [viz. to death] for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. ‡—Who gave himself for our sins. ||—For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust. §—Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree” ¶||

Such is the plea of our “Advocate with the Father :” and when the sinner “comes to God through him” who “ever liveth to make intercession” for him,—when he takes hold on the plea of his Advocate,—he is *justified*. That is, says Mr. G., “all his previous faults are *forgiven*.” ** The same act of God being called *justification*, when considered as the act of a righteous Judge, and *pardon* when considered as the act of a gracious Father. That, according to the scriptures, he is justified or forgiven on the plea of Jesus Christ, his Advocate, the following passages will testify. “By his knowledge [the knowledge of himself] shall my righteous servant *justify* many ; for he shall bear their iniquities. ††—All have sinned and come short of the glory of God : being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ: whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in his blood. ‡‡—Who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification. ||||—Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.” §§

As this is the plea on which the sinner is justified, it is the subject of his subsequent glorying. He can now say,

* Rom. vi. 23. † Isa. liii. 4—12. ‡ Rom. iv. 25. || Gal. i. 4.

§ 1 Pet. iii. 18. ¶ 1 Pet. ii. 24. ** Vol. II. p. 167. †† Isa. liii. 11.

‡‡ Rom. iii. 23—25. || || Rom. iv. 25. §§ Rom. v. 9.

"Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died; yea rather, that is risen again: who is even at the right hand of God: who also maketh intercession for us." *

Having taken a general survey of what the sacred writers have taught, we now examine what weight there is in Mr. G.'s objections.

1. "He insinuates that the Prophets, John the Baptist, our Lord, and his Apostles, were *silent* on this subject." †

The whole strength of this argument consists in Mr. G.'s having substituted the phraseology of theologists for that of the scriptures. He requires us to prove, that the sacred writers speak of Jesus Christ as "*satisfying infinite justice*, or appeasing the wrath of an offended God." ‡ We here enter our protest against this perpetual shifting of the terms. The question to be discussed is, whether the sacrifice of Christ be propitiatory? If this should be decided in the affirmative, we may leave to speculative men to enquire whether a *propitiatory sacrifice* can in any sense be said to "*satisfy infinite justice*," or to "*appease the wrath* of an offended God?" But, however this last question may be decided, the first is not all affected by the decision. To give solidity to his reasoning, Mr. G. ought to prove that the Old and the New Testament do not speak of the death of Jesus Christ as a sacrifice for sins, a ransom or price of redemption, and the plea on which a sinner is justified. *Hic labor; hoc opus est!* The reader will scarcely need to be informed that this is beyond the power of Socinian magic.

We have seen already, that the sacrificial code of the Levitical institution is replete with types of the sacrifice for sin, which Jesus Christ should offer. The fifty-third chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah, almost the whole of which we have already quoted, speaks of the death of Christ as the *consequence* of our iniquity being laid on him, as the chastisement of our peace, as an offering for our sin, and as the plea on which we are justified.—John the Baptist, with an

* Rom. viii. 33, 34. † Vol. II. pp. 171, 175, 180. ‡ Vol. II. p. 171.

obvious allusion to the lamb offered as a sin-offering, (Lev. iv. 32,) called the attention of the Jews to Jesus Christ, as “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.”*—Our Lord said, “The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many. †—The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. ‡—This is [the sign of] my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins:”|| And before he was parted from “his Apostles,” he said unto them, “These are the words which I spake unto you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me—[the things to which we have now alluded.] Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, [which before they did not understand,] and said unto them, *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name.*” §—Thus instructed, and thus understanding the scriptures, the Apostles went forth and preached *forgiveness of sins through him.* “Repent, (said they,) and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, [be “baptized into his death:” Rom. vi. 3.] for the remission of sins. ¶—They that dwell at Jerusalem desired Pilate that he should be slain. And when they had fulfilled *all that was written of him,* (See Isa. liii.) they laid him in a sepulchre. But God raised him from the dead. Be it known unto you therefore, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him, all that believe are *justified* from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.”** When Philip joined the Ethiopian Eunuch, and found him reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, he “*began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus.*”†† This subject, however, like every other Christian doctrine, is not so fully recorded in that book which contains rather the *Acts,* than the *Doctrine,*

* John i. 29. † Matt. xx. 28. ‡ John vi. 51. || Matt. xxvi. 28.

§ Luke xxiv. 44—47. ¶ Acts ii. 38. ** Acts xiii. 27—30, 38, 39.

†† Acts viii. 35.

of the Apostles, as in their Epistles, from which we have already adduced various specimens.*

2. Mr. G. thinks there are “two main points upon which this question rests. (1st.) Do you believe that a great and material change took place in the *nature, attributes, character*, of the ONE SUPREME?” † No: we do not. We believe only that change was wrought by the atonement, which Mr. G. attributes to the *mere repentance* of a criminal: and that God, having set forth Christ a propitiatory through faith in his blood, could be *just* and yet the *justifier* of him that believeth in Jesus.—(2.) “Do you believe that this change took place in consequence of the *death of a God?*” ‡—No. We believe that “God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and *περι αμαρτιας*, a sacrifice for sin, || *condemned sin in the FLESH;*” § that the Christian atonement was made by “the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ.” From these “two main points upon which (according to Mr. G.) this question rests,” it appears that he is only pursuing a phantom, the creature of his own imagination, and controverting a doctrine which no man in his sober senses believes.

If that was the case, (says Mr. G.) “then it could have been a man only who accomplished the atonement.” ¶—We answer: The *human nature* was the saerifice, which “by the Eternal Spirit he offered without spot to God:” and therefore “his blood can purge our consciences from dead works.—God (therefore) was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing to them their trespasses.”

3. You must, however, says Mr. G., be reduced to the following dilemma; either that the mercy of the Father

* Mr. G., as usual, has referred to the *unbelieving Jews*, who “did not even expect a *suffering Messiah*.” (Vol. II. p. 174.) This is not the only proof that the *unbelief* of the Jews is the standard of Socinian *faith*. He is perfectly welcome to all the support which he can derive from their testimony. † Vol. II. p. 158. ‡ Vol. II. p. 158.

|| So the LXX use that phrase in Isaiah liii. 10: and so the Apostle uses it in Heb. x. 6. Ολοκαυτωματα και περι αμαρτιας υκευδοχησας: which our translators render, “In burnt-offerings and *sacrifices for sins*, thou hast had no pleasure.”

† Rom. viii. 3.

¶ Vol. II. p. 191.

was not equal to the mercy of the Son, or that the justice of the Son was not equal to the justice of the Father.”*

Before we answer this objection, it is necessary to understand an obvious and common distinction with respect to divine justice. “Justice, as it respects moral character, has with propriety been distinguished into *distributive* and *public*.” As we may hereafter find it necessary to recur to this distinction, it will be well to explain what we mean by it. “*Distributive* justice consists in a due administration of rewards and punishments according to personal desert. *Public* justice has respect to the well-being of the whole. Its province is to guard the rights of moral government, and take care that the divine authority be not impaired.”†

Any doctrine may be made to appear absurd by being misrepresented. According to Mr. G.’s representation of our doctrine, there are two Gods,—the Father and the Son. The Father is just and unmerciful. The Son is merciful but regardless of justice. The Son, one of these Gods, sacrifices his Divinity to the justice of the Father, the other God. Appeased by this sacrifice, the Father forgives the criminal, not in mercy but in mere justice!—This may be absurd enough! But whose doctrine is it? Not ours.—Let the scriptural doctrine be stated, and Mr. G.’s dilemma vanishes. “God so loved the world (was so merciful) that he gave his only-begotten Son,” that human person “in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead.” This human person, “by the Eternal Spirit,” which dwelt in him without measure, “offered himself without spot to God, an offering and a sacrifice, for a sweet-smelling savour.” By this display of public justice in “condemning sin in the flesh,” this human person is “set forth a propitiatory through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare his righteousness, that he might be just, as to his *public* character, and yet surrender the claims of *distributive* justice as the (merciful) justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.” Thus the mercy of the Father is exercised, and *distributive* justice is waved, without any infringement on *public* justice. The

* Vol. II. p. 188. † Jerram on the Atonement, Let. IV. p. 22.

Father is merciful in providing and accepting the sacrifice, and just in requiring it. The Son is merciful in offering the sacrifice in our behalf; and just in his concern for the maintenance of public justice, in thus preserving the sanction of the righteous law inviolate, in "magnifying the law, and making it honourable."—Where is now this formidable dilemma? If Mr. G. still think that on our principles the Son as well as the Father, if he were *just*, must have demanded a similar atonement, the opinion can only arise out of the same mistaken notion of our real principles. It was the Divine, and not the human nature which was to be propitiated.

4. "Will it be said that God himself *provided* the atonement to be made to himself? Then it renders the whole doctrine a complete nullity. If a person owe me a sum of money, is it not the same thing whether I remit the debt at once, or supply another person with money to pay me again in the debtor's name? If satisfaction be made to any purpose, it must be in some manner in which the *offender* may be a *sufferer*, and the offended person a gainer."*

This argument is rather specious than solid, and all its apparent weight arises, partly out of the confusion of the various terms which are used, and partly out of the change of their application. (1.) Mr. G. sets out with speaking of an *atonement*, and then changes that term for the word, *satisfaction*. Now many persons use the word *atonement* in its proper sense, who do not think that the term, *satisfaction*, is perfectly synonymous. Mr. G. should remember, that, like Dr. Priestley, he undertakes to controvert "the whole doctrine of atonement, with every modification of it."† Whatever he may have to urge against the term *satisfaction*, will therefore make nothing against a proper *atonement* or *propitiation*. (2.) He uses the term *satisfaction*, in a sense which those judicious men who think proper to make use of it, will not acknowledge. And then (3.) To make out his objection, he changes the sense of the term, from the satisfaction required by a moral governor—the exaction of a legal penalty, to that required by a creditor—the payment of a

* Vol. II. p. 191. † Hist. of Corrup. Vol. I. p. 154.

debt.—Thus this unscriptural word has, in one argument, no less than three different applications, not one of which we should admit, if we admit the use of the term.

Now as (1.) this term is not scriptural, and (2.) it is apt to be so variously and improperly applied, we shall not contend a moment for the use of it. But as it may still be objected that we retain the idea, while we decline to contend for the word, we will explain ourselves. We have already distinguished between the several classes of terms by which the design of the death of Christ is illustrated in the New Testament; we will now enquire, to which of those classes the idea of satisfaction may be attached, if attached at all; and in what sense it is attached.

(1.) We conceive that it cannot properly be attached to the “terms of emancipation”—It is true, when Jesus Christ is said to “give his life a ransom for many,” the idea conveyed by those terms is that of the redemption of a captive, who has been sold or imprisoned for his debt. It is, therefore, only another way of speaking of the payment of a debt. Now the payment of a debt is a *satisfaction* to the creditor. We do not suppose, however, that the death of Christ is represented as a *ransom*, because it was positively the *payment of a debt*, but because it answers a purpose with respect to the sinner, similar to that which the payment of a debt answers with respect to the debtor. The debtor is acquitted in the one case; the sinner in the other. Beyond this point the analogy vanishes. Hence the scriptures nowhere say, that Christ gave himself a ransom to *God*: but, that he gave himself a ransom *for us*; and that “he gave himself an *offering* and a *sacrifice to God*.”

(2.) We conceive that it cannot properly be attached to the *sacrificial* terms.—On making the experiment, we find that we cannot attach it, naturally and easily, without adopting

(3.) The *judicial* terms, to which therefore, if at all, it must be attached.—We have already observed, that justice is either *distributive* or *public*. The first question then, is: “Are we to regard the death of Christ as a penalty exacted by *distributive*, or *public*, justice?” Certainly, not by *distributive*,

butive justice, because [1.] the penalty exacted by distributive justice is, the death of the offender; and [2.] the design of the death of Christ is, to obtain mercy for the offender; or, in other words, to provide that distributive justice may relinquish its demands. It must then be *public* justice which exacted the penalty, and on account of which he “was delivered for our offences.” “Public justice has regard to the well-being of the whole. Its province is to guard the rights of moral government, and to take care that the divine authority be not impaired.” (See p. 201.) To secure this end of public justice—“God hath set forth Jesus Christ a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his *righteousness* for the remission of sins, through the forbearance of God; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.”

If the reader think that that which supports the authority of moral government, when *distributive* justice is surrendered, and thereby answers the demands of public justice, be a *satisfaction* to *public* justice, he will not ask Mr. G.’s leave to call it so. But we choose rather to abide by the scriptural terms, which are not liable to the same exceptions as those which are of human invention.

After this explanation we contend, that, although to “supply another person with money to pay me again in the debtor’s name,” is much the same thing as to “remit the debt at once;”—for God to provide that *public* justice may not be impaired by the surrender of *distributive* justice, is not the same thing as to remit the claims of distributive justice without such a provision. In the one case the tone of authority is relaxed; in the other it is strictly maintained. Or, to return to the point from which Mr. G. set out, and to which he ought to have adhered: The end of an atonement may equally be answered, *whocver* may *provide* the sacrifice. Thus all the sin-offerings which, under the Old Testament, were offered to God as atonements for sin, were provided by *HIM* to whom they were offered, whose are “the cattle upon a thousand hills.”

5. “But this doctrine converts *justice* into vengeance. It first plunges its sword into the soul of the innocent; it

afterwards pursues multitudes of those whose punishment he bore, and relentlessly plunges them into the flames of hell, because they cannot satisfy its demands, which were all satisfied by his suffering in their stead.” *—This objection is levelled, point-blank, at the doctrine of divine revelation, and therefore requires a serious answer.

(1.) It is from the book of God we learn that the Lord of hosts said, “ Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man [that is] my fellow ; smite the shepherd.” † Mr. G. will not find it easy, on the Socinian scheme, to account for justice “ plunging its sword into the soul of the innocent.” This can be done only according to that *evangelical* system, which teaches that “ it pleased the Lord to bruise him ; that he was wounded for our transgressions ; that he was *bruised for our iniquities* ; and that the *chastisement of our peace* was upon him.” —From the same source of instruction, we have learned that they who “ deny the Lord that bought them, bring on themselves swift destruction.” ‡ Nor is it *our* doctrine that thus “ converts the *justice* of God into *vengeance*,” but that of HIM who hath said, “ Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord.” ||

(2.) There is no injustice in the final punishment of *obstinate sinners*, although Jesus Christ have died for their sins. If the death of Christ had been intended to procure *absolutely* the forgiveness of the sins for which he died, justice might then require even the forgiveness of the impenitent and unbelieving. But if the blood of Christ be the blood of the new covenant, a covenant which demands “ repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ,” “ for the remission of sins,” —the “ *faithfulness and justice*” which require the absolution of those who, with a proper reference to the propitiatory sacrifice, “ confess their sins,” do not require the absolution of those who obstinately continue in their sin and unbelief. “ God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth in him, might not perish, but have everlasting life.*” § They, therefore, who obstinately *refuse to*

* Vol. II. p. 134.

+ Zech. xiii. 7.

† 2 Pet. ii. 1.

|| Heb. x. 30.

§ John iii. 16.

believe in him, are justly left to “die in their iniquity.” “If we sin wilfully [by rejecting reconciliation] after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.” The sinner, then, is justly charged, not only with the sins the pardon of which he has obstinately refused, but with that of “treading under foot the Son of God,” and of “counting the blood of the covenant a common thing.”—In other words: The end of *public* justice is not answered by the death of Christ, in those who live and die impenitent, and, therefore, must be answered by the exercise of *distributive* justice.

6. The next objection to be considered, is that which is taken from the necessity of repentance, of forgiveness of injuries, and of good works, in order to eternal salvation. From hence Mr. G. boldly infers that there is no room for any other atonement. *

(1.) Repentance is undoubtedly necessary for the forgiveness of sins; but it does not follow that repentance *only* is necessary. It has been already proved by many scriptural arguments, that we are justified by the blood of Christ.—It is also a well-known fact, that St. Peter exhorted the Jews not only to repent, but to “be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the *forgiveness of sins*. ”† As “enemies to God in their minds by wicked works,” mankind are properly exhorted to renounce that enmity by genuine repentance; but the Apostles, who thus beseech them, “Be ye reconciled to God,” state the medium of that reconciliation to be, that God “hath made him (Christ) to be *αμαρτιαν*, a sin-offering for us, who knew no sin: that we might be made the righteousness of God in him:” and that thus “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.”‡

Should the Socinians still urge, that, under the Old Testament, genuine penitents were pardoned, although they knew nothing of the Christian atonement,—we answer, that *they applied to the promised mercy of God*:

*Vol. I. p. 172, 178, 179, 187.

† Acts ii. 32.

‡ 2 Cor. v. 19—21.

but that mercy, though they understood not perfectly the medium through which it was exercised, was extended through the predicted atonement of Christ. This is supposed to be the meaning of those words: “Whom God has set forth a propitiatory, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.”*

(2.) Our Lord has undoubtedly enforced the forgiveness of injuries on pain of the divine displeasure, and made it *one* of the terms of our forgiveness, and consequently of our salvation. But this is no way inconsistent with our being forgiven, for the sake of what Christ has suffered. If a Socinian cannot reconcile them, he may submit to be instructed by an Apostle who said, “Be kind one to another, tender-hearted, *forgiving one another*, even as God for Christ’s sake hath forgiven you.”†

(3.) On the subject of justification by *good works*, i. e. by universal *holiness*, it will be necessary to make some distinction. Mr. G. has distinguished between the justification of a *sinner* on earth, and what he calls a “future justification,” when “we must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and give an account of ourselves to God.”‡ Of the former he observes, “the Apostle Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, says, Being justified by faith, we have peace with God;” and of the *latter*, that “the sentence to be pronounced at the day of judgment is invariably stated to be pronounced according to the works of the individual.”|| To all this we agree. It is a little curious, however, that after making this *distinction*, and after stating that the justification of a sinner is “by faith,” he should “rest the case upon this striking fact alone,” § viz. that mankind are *finally* to be judged according to their works. If the distinction which he has made be just, the proof that “the DOERS of the law shall be justified, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ,” ¶ is no argument against that scriptural truth, “that (in the day

* Rom. iii. 25.

|| Vol. II. p. 192.

† Eph. iv. 32.

§ Vol. II. p. 193.

‡ Vol. II. p. 168.

¶ Rom. ii. 13, 16.

of grace) a man is justified by *faith*, without the *DEEDS* of the law.”*

Here we might quote a number of passages to shew, that “to him that *worketh not* but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, his *faith is counted to him for righteousness.*”† But Mr. G., aware how numerous such passages are, has evaded them all by stating that, “when the Apostle Paul speaks of faith and works, as in contrast with each other, by *works*, he means the *ceremonies of the Jewish law.*”‡ With what propriety this bold assertion is made, we will examine.

“ Whatsoever things the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God.”—Is it the *ceremonial* law, by which every mouth is stopped, and which proves all the world to be guilty?—“ Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin?” Is it the *ceremonial* law by which is the *knowledge of sin?* The Apostle says, “ I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, *Thou shalt not covet.*”|| Is it then the *ceremonial* law which has said, “ *Thou shalt not covet?*” Every one knows that this is the language of the *moral* law. Continuing to speak of *that*, the Apostle proceeds to point out the proper mean of justification.—“ But now the righteousness of God *without the law*, is manifested, even the righteousness of God which is by *faith of Jesus Christ*, unto all and upon all them that *believe*: being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth a propitiatory through faith in his blood. Therefore we conclude that a man is *justified by faith* without the *deeds of the law.*” Hence he subjoins, “ Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea we *establish the law.*”§—Certainly not the *ceremonial*, but the *moral*, law is established by faith.

This subject might be prosecuted much further; but this is enough in reply to Mr. G.’s mere assertion.

* Rom. iii. 28.

† Rom. iv. 5.

‡ Vol. II. p. 169.

|| Rom. viii. 7.

§ Rom. iii. 19.—31.

There is no more inconsistency between a sinner's being "justified (in the day of grace,) by the blood of Christ," and his being rewarded in the day of judgment, according to the deeds (subsequently) done in the body," than there is between a rebel's being pardoned by the clemency of his prince, and his being afterwards rewarded for his subsequent faithful services. Nor is the doctrine of *justification*, *by the death of Christ*, unfavourable to *obedience*. It is the only mean by which piety and morality can be established among men. The love of God, and of our neighbour, is the sum of the law, which, therefore, he that loveth hath fulfilled. But "herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be *the propitiation* for our sins. We love him because he first loved us. And if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."*—What the law could not do,, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and a sacrifice for sin, (see p. 200.) condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."†

The saerifice of Christ is not only an expiation ; it is also an ablution. The Reader will perhaps remember, that under the Levitical dispensation, the red heifer was appointed as a representation of both these purposes, but principally of the latter. This animal was "brought forth *without* the camp" and slain. Her blood was then sprinkled "seven times before the tabernacle of the congregation." The whole carcase was then burned, and her ashes preserved to make "a water of separation, a *purification* for sin."‡ In allusion to this institution, the Apostle to the Hebrews says: "For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary for sin, are burned without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might *sanctify* the people with his own blood, *suffered without the gate.*"|| There is the same allusion in those words : "If the blood of bulls and of goats, [as expiations]

* 1 John iv. 10, 11, 19.

‡ Num. xix. 1, 3, 4, 9.

† Rom. viii. 3, 4.

|| Heb. xiii. 11, 12.

and the ashes of an heifer [as a *purification* for sin] sprinkling the unclean, *sanctifieth* to the *purifying* of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works [as an expiation, and thereby sanctify to the *purifying* of the soul] to serve the living God," and thus answer all the purpose of an ablution? * On earth "the *blood* of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin," and therefore in heaven, the moral purity of glorified saints is ascribed to the efficacy of this great sacrifice. "These are they that have come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the *blood* of the Lamb." † And hence, all their salvation is attributed "to him that hath loved us and *washed* us from our sins in his own *blood*." ‡

For the sake of meeting these difficulties in a scriptural manner, we have already distinguished three classes of ideas and terms, by which the subject before us is revealed. To these we may add another class which we may denominate *domestic*. Of all these it is worth while to observe, that each of them is used for particular purposes. (1.) The *domestic* terms are used to point out the *aggravated nature* and *ruinous consequences of sin*, the *nature* and *propriety* of *repentance*, and the *readiness* with which God *forgives* the *penitent*. Of this observation the parable of the *prodigal Son* is the best illustration. They are used also to shew that God will forgive sin, *only* on terms which are consistent with the good order of his family. Hence we are taught to pray, "Our Father which art in heaven—forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us!"—(2.) The *sacrificial* terms are used to give us the most proper views of the design of the death of Christ, as the *object* of our *faith*, the *medium* of our *access to God*, and the *meritorious cause* of our *pardon* and *acceptance*. (3.) The *judicial* terms are used to shew how the *forgiveness of offending man* is rendered consistent with the public *justice* of the *offended God*: how "*mercy and truth* meet together, and *righteousness and peace* have kissed each other." (4.) The terms of *emancipation* are to shew, that our *redemption*

* Heb. x. 13, 14.

† Rev. vii. 14.

‡ Rev. i. 3.

obliges us to serve and obey our Redeemer. “Ye are not your own, (says St. Paul) for ye are bought with a price, therefore *glorify God* in your body and in your spirit, which are God’s.”

But no *one* class of terms will perfectly answer every purpose of divine revelation. It is not by a partial view, that we can form just ideas of this subject in all its bearings, but by a comprehensive view of the whole. Jehovah is not to be regarded merely as a *Father*, but as a *Redeemer*, a *Moral Governor*, and a *God*. Hence the sacred writers, for the complicated purposes already specified, sometimes mingle in one sentence all the various classes of terms which we have enumerated. The two following passages will afford the most perfect specimens.—“If ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons *judgeth according to every man’s work*, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear ; forasmuch as ye know that ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the *precious blood* of Christ, as of a *lamb without blemish and without spot*.*—All have sinned, and comeshort of the glory of God; being *justified* freely by his grace, through the *redemption* that is in Christ Jesus : whom God hath set forth a *propitiation* through faith in his *blood*, to declare his righteousness for the *remission of sins* that are past, through the *forbearance* of God : —that he might be *just*, and the *justifier* of him which believeth in Jesus.”†—If the Reader observe that the terms “the *blood of a lamb without blemish and without spot*,” are *sacrificial*: and the terms “*remission of sins* through the *forbearance of God*,” are used in allusion to *paternal kindness* and *mercy*, and are *domestic*, he will see that the *four* classes of terms are distinctly adopted in both these passages.

(7.) “But it is evident from several of our Lord’s discourses, that he considered that the Apostles, by *their death*, were to accomplish the same object as *he* by *his death*.”‡

This objection furnishes a strong argument in favour of the doctrine which we have endeavoured to establish. The

* 1 Pet. i. 17—19.

† Rom. iii. 23—26.

‡ Vol. II. p. 192.

Apostles suffered in the cause of truth as well as their Master. “They drank of his cup, and were baptized with his baptism;” and they call on us to follow their example as they followed his. But was Paul “crucified for us?” or were any “baptized in his name for the remission of sins?” Were they “made a *sin-offering* for us?” Did they “redeem any of us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us?” Are we “justified by their blood?” These are, however, the objects which are said to be accomplished by the death of Christ: objects which the Apostles never imagined would be accomplished by *theirs*:—This vast superiority of the design and efficacy of the death of Christ will be eternally celebrated, when all the sprinkled race shall join in the anti-Socinian song, “*Thou wast SLAIN, and hast REDEEMED us to God, by thy BLOOD, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.*”

CHAPTER XI.

Of the Eternity of the future Punishment of the Wicked.

IT is a strong indication of the badness of a cause, when its Advocate, at the opening of his plea, assails the ear of the Judge with appeals to his passions rather than to his reason. Mr. G. has not, however, been prudent enough to lull our suspicions by avoiding this manœuvre. To prepossess the mind of the reader, he has represented the God of his own system as uniting in himself every thing which he deems amiable, while the God of his opponents is caricatured as a hideous assemblage of every thing terrific. Like one who can suit his friends with Gods according to their own heart, he then calls upon them to make their choice.

Before the reader fix his choice in a matter so important, it will be well for him to review the drawings which Mr. G. has sketched. The God whom we are supposed to worship, he caricatures thus:—"He is a monarch, a *small proportion* of whose subjects are his avowed *favourites* and friends. These he crowns with the highest honours, and loads with the greatest dignities; they sit around his throne and enjoy his smiles and favours; but at least *nine-tenths* of the subjects of this monarch are immersed in gloomy dungeons; 'shut from the common air, and common use of their own limbs,' enchain'd in the *blackness of darkness*, exposed to repeated and increasing *racks* and tortures of every kind; their deep horrific groans continually assail his ear, their distorted limbs and writhing agonies meet his eye in every direction, whilst he, *well-pleased*, looks on and smiles in calm complaisance." *

* Vol. I. p. 201.

Perhaps some shrewd men will think they behold here a *distorted* likeness of the God who has been worshipped in some parts of Christendom. For our part, we think that if Moloch can “smile,” he must be the true original. At any rate, this is not the God who has revealed himself in the Bible, and whom *we* adore. We worship a God “with whom there is *no respect of persons*: *—who is good to all, and whose tender mercies are over *all his works*: †—who so loved the *world* that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life: ‡—who θελει, *wisheth* all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth: ||—who is long-suffering to usward, μη βελοφενος, *not willing* that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance: §—who has no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: ¶—and who even beseeches the rebellious to be reconciled to him. **

But if we reject this hideous devil-god, whom Mr. G. has presented to our imagination, in order to drive us to the worship of another of his own making, let us examine whether this latter be more like the true God. “ You shall [now] be introduced to a monarch who reigns over his subjects with parental *kindness*; he considers *all* as his children; he feels a tender concern and love for *all*; his laws are equitable and impartial; his grand object is to make *all happy*; the obstinate, the wayward, the rebellious, he is compelled to punish; but his punishment is *proportioned to the degree* of their guilt, and the object of it still is to guide them to reformation, and to happiness.” ††

This Being is something more like “the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” But, however amiable he may appear, we have reason to complain that, to serve an hypothesis, he is robbed of an essential part of his real character. That our God is a Father, we acknowledge with filial gratitude; but not, that he is as Mr. G. has represented him, a Father *only*. If the character of a Father would have perfectly represented to us “the God of judgment,” why,

* Rom. ii. 11. † Psalm cxlv. 9. ‡ John iii. 16. || 1 Tim. ii. 4.

§ 2 Pet. iii. 9. ¶ Ezek. xxxiii. 11. ** 2 Cor. v. 20. †† Vol. II. p. 200.

in making him known to us, are other characters, very different from this, though not opposed to it, used by the sacred writers? Mr. G., it is true, makes mention of him as a “Monarch,” and speaks of “his laws,” and of the “punishment” of the “rebellious,” but he takes care to lose the *Monarch* in the *Father*, and his *judicial* punishments in *parental chastisements*. The *character* of a moral governor is thus entirely blotted out, and the *name* only is left; while all the unmingled affection of a parent remains. Such a character as Mr. G. has drawn may suit the mere father of a family, and in him would be truly amiable, but it does not exactly suit the “Governor of all the earth.” However proper it may be for a moral governor to chastise corrigible offenders for their amendment, it is also his part “not to bear the sword in vain [by which daring rebels and incorrigible offenders are cut off];—for he is a *revenger* to execute *wrath* upon him that doeth evil.” *

The nature of the divine government as described in the scriptures, is of such importance to the present subject, that it demands our particular consideration. God is not a Governor who merely gives *rules of conduct* to his subjects, and *chastises* the transgressors for their *amendment*; but who maintains his authority by declaring himself that “ONE LAWGIVER, who is able to save and to *destroy*.” †—The penalties by which his laws are enforced, are not such as do not touch the *life* of the criminal; they are *capital* punishments. The language of his law is, “The soul that sinneth, it shall *die*.” ‡—That penalty is not designed for the *final benefit* of the *offender*. The divine authority has indeed appointed it, *a priori*, for the benefit of the governed, by the *prevention* of crimes; but it is not *inflicted*, *a posteriori*, for the final benefit of those who disregard that authority. “Cursed,” therefore, “is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” || His offending subjects who are *finally* impenitent, are no longer regarded by him with *paternal affection*. “It is a people of no understanding: therefore he that made them will not have mercy on them, and he that formed them

* Rom. xiii. 4. † James v. 12. ‡ Ezek. xviii. 4. || Gal. iii. 10.

will shew them no favour. *—For our God is a consuming fire. †—The Lord trieth the righteous: but the wicked, and him that loveth violence, his soul hateth. Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup. ‡—He [the sinner] shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation.” ||

From this distinction between the *parental* and the *regal* character of the Most High, arises another distinction equally obliterated by the Socinians, and yet equally scriptural: that between the *wholesome chastisement* which is intended for the amendment of the offender, and the *judicial punishment* which is inflicted on the incorrigible. This distinction is marked by circumstances which are specifically attributed to the one, and are positively denied of the other. Thus: “Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.” § But it cannot be a proof of his love to the *disobedient*, that “he will render unto them indignation and wrath;” ¶ for “the wicked his soul hateth;” ** nor can God be said to *receive* those to whom he says, “I never knew you! Depart from me, ye that work iniquity!” ††—“If we endure chastening, God dealeth with us as with sons; and if we be without chastisement, then are we bastards and not sons.” ‡‡ But it is not equally true that “we are bastards and not sons,” if we be without *the damnation of hell*, and if Christ say, “Come, ye blessed of my Father. |||—Blessed is the man whom the Lord chasteneth;” §§ but they are not blessed to whom the King shall say “Depart from me, οι κατηραμενοι, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels.” ¶¶ So essential is the difference between the *chastisement* of God’s children, and the *punishment* of his rebellious subjects!

But Mr. G. positively asserts, that when our Lord says, “These shall go away into everlasting punishment,” he

* Isa. xxvii. 11. † Heb. xii. 29. ‡ Psalm xi. 5, 6. || Rev. xiv. 10.

§ Heb. xii. 6. ¶ Rom. ii. 8. ** Psalm xi. 5. †† Matt. vii. 23.

‡‡ Heb. xii. 7, 8. ||| Matt. xxv. 34. §§ Psalm xciv. 12. ¶¶ Matt. xxv. 41.

means “*corrective chastisement*.”* To prove this, he exhibits the usual criticism on the word *κολάσις*, which our translators render *punishment*, and which he thinks decisive in favour of the opinion, that to “go accursed into everlasting fire,” is to receive “the benefit” of a “*corrective chastisement*:” While we take the liberty to contradict his statement, the Reader will keep in mind that Mr. G. rests the question on the meaning of this word, and undertakes to prove that it *does* and *must* mean “*corrective chastisement*. ”

—Now for the proof.

1. “In this sense it was used by heathen Greek writers and philosophers.”†—But not one of them is quoted, so that this stands for—*nothing*. Besides, if they were quoted, and the passages should be found to prove that *κολάσις* is sometimes used in this sense; how is it proved that it is never used in any other sense?

2. “Grotius states it to be one of the words used by them, in reference to such punishments as were intended for the *benefit* of him who *offended*, or of him to whom it was of importance that the offence should not have been committed, or in short, for the *benefit* of some one.”‡—So it appears from Grotius, that *κολάσις* does not always mean a punishment inflicted for the *benefit* of the *offender*, but sometimes for the *benefit* of him who is injured by the offence!

3. “The two passages in the New Testament in which the verb, *κολαζω*, is used, perfectly accord with, if they do not require, the same construction. Acts iv. 21. 2 Pet. ii. 9.”||—To make good Mr. G.’s argument, the word must *absolutely* “require” this construction. But as he has not descended to examine those texts, that task devolves upon us.—The first of these passages is as follows: “When they [the Jewish rulers] had further threatened them [Peter and John] they let them go, finding nothing how *κολασωνται*, they might *punish* them, because of the people.” These rulers *dared not*, at one time, to lay their hands on Jesus Christ, for *fear of the people*; but when that fear was removed they put him to death. The fear of the people, in like manner, restrained them, in the present case, from

* Vol. II. p. 206. † Vol. II. p. 206. ‡ Vol. II. p. 205. || Vol. II. p. 208.

putting Peter and John to death. But how will it be made to appear, that if they had dared to slay them, they would have inflicted that punishment as a *salutary chastisement*?—The other passage runs thus: “The Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment, *κολασμένους*, to be *punished*.”—The punishment here referred to, is that to be inflicted in “*the day of judgment*.” To suppose then that the word here means a *corrective chastisement*, is to *take for granted* the very thing which should be *proved*.

4. “The word, *κολασίς*, occurs in only one other place in the New Testament, and there it relates to the effects produced upon the body and mind by the operation of *fear*. 1 John iv. 18.”*—The words are, “Fear hath *κολασίν*, torment.”—But how does it appear that here it means “*corrective chastisement*?”

We do not find then that Mr. G. has made out his case: viz. that “this term so far from encouraging, *directly opposes*, the supposition of never-ending torments.”†

After this examination, that the meaning of the word may not be left in any degree of uncertainty, it becomes necessary to shew that *κολασίς* is a very proper word to express a *vindictive punishment*.

1. Andreas Cæsar, in his commentary on Rev. xiv. 11, observes: “‘It is said that their smoke ascendeth up for ever and ever, that we may learn that *κολασίν*, the *punishment* of the wicked is *ατέλευτην*, *endless*, as also the rest of the righteous is *ιωνιν*, *everlasting*.’—Here we have the word in dispute, connected with an adjective which expressly fixes its meaning to *endless*; and consequently here it must mean more than a *corrective, limited punishment*.

2. “The next example shall be taken from Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who was cotemporary with, and the disciple of, John. He answered the pro-consul who threatened to burn him, ‘You threaten me with a fire that burns for an hour, and shall shortly be extinguished, but are ignorant that there is a fire of future judgment, and everlasting

* Vol. II. p. 205.

† Vol. II. p. 208.

κολασσος, *punishment*, reserved for the ungodly.* The *antitheses*, in this passage, evidently point out a punishment *endless* in its duration: and as this venerable martyr has used this word in a sense entirely unlimited, we have a proof that *κολασις* is a proper word for expressing a future, vindictive punishment.

3. “The next example is from Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, who, in his defence of Gregory Nyssene, shewed from scripture, ‘That as the rest of the righteous is unspeakable, so also *κολασις*, the *punishment* of the wicked is *ατελευτητον*, *endless* and most intolerable.’† Here again the adjective connected with it, fixing its meaning to *endless*, shews that more is meant than a *limited* and *corrective* punishment.

4. “The last example shall be from Lucian. Tantalus, deplored his dreadful state in the infernal regions, as being ready to perish with thirst in the midst of abundance of water, says to Menippus, ‘This is the very nature of my *κολασις punishment*, that my soul should thirst, as though it were a body.’ This *punishment* is called, in a line or two below, *καταδικη*, *vindictive*.”‡

Hitherto, we have been proving that the future punishment of the wicked is not designed for their *correction*. It was necessary first to settle this point, because if that punishment were intended for their *correction*, it probably would sooner or later have an end.—We now come to that part of the evidence which goes to prove that that punishment will be positively eternal.

The English Reader will very easily advert to the following passages of Holy Writ:—“Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into *everlasting* fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. ||—And these shall go away into *everlasting punishment*. §—Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee; it is better for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into the *everlasting* fire. ¶—The Lord

* Epis. Smyr. Eccles. † Photius, Cod. 233. ‡ Scrutator, p. 89, 90.

¶ Matt. xxv, 41.

§ Matt. xxv, 16.

¶ Matt. xvii, 8.

Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ ; who shall be punished with *everlasting* destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.*—He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, is in danger of *eternal* damnation.†—These are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved *for ever.*‡—These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear ; clouds without water, carried about with winds ; trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots ; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame ; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness *for ever.*||—If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation ; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of his holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb ; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up *for ever and ever.*”§

Mr. G is well aware how this last passage will overturn his whole hypothesis, and therefore he has taken some pains to expunge it. (1.) To shew that this passage relates to *temporal* events, he cites the eighth verse : “ Babylon is fallen.”¶ But Babylon may fall on *earth* first, and the *Babylonians* may be punished in *hell* afterwards. (2.) He objects that “ the passage does not assert that the *persons* should be tortured for this length of time, but that the *smoke* thereof should ascend.”** This is curious enough, and may serve to shew to what shifts some men will condescend. How can the *smoke* of *their torment* ascend, when *they* are *no longer tormented*? Whatever smoke may ascend, cannot be the *smoke* of *their torment*, when their torment it at an end. (3.) To secure this point, however,

* 2 Thess. i. 7—9.

|| Jude 12, 13.

† Mark iii. 29.

§ Rev. xix. 9—11.

‡ 2 Pet. ii. 17.

** Vol. II. p. 235.

¶ Vol. II. p. 235.

that the smoke of their torment may ascend when they are no longer tormented, Mr. G. ventures to say that “the phrase is taken from Isa. xiv. 10.” where it is said, “And the streams thereof shall be turned to pitch, and the dust thereof to brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched day nor night: the smoke thereof shall go up for ever, &c. *—Now what is there in all this passage to shew that a smoke can ascend which can properly be called *the smoke of their torment*, when their torment has long ago ceased?

The English Reader can have no doubt, whether, if the preceding translations be just, the doctrine of eternal punishment be true. But the premises are not allowed by our opponents. It is in vain to urge that our Translators understood something of Greek; neither their learning nor their integrity can be relied on by a Socinian. It is therefore a matter of absolute necessity to re-examine the subject.

The word *αιων* is derived from two words *αει ον* which signify, *always being*. This etymology points out the ideal meaning of the word *αιων*: which properly signifies the whole duration of that being to which it is applied, in that respect in which it is applied. It cannot reasonably be denied that Aristotle understood the meaning of it, and the use which was made of it by his cotemporaries and predecessors in Grecian literature. Speaking of God and celestial intelligences, he says, “They neither inhabit place, nor wax old by time, nor are subject to changes or passions, but living the best and most satisfying life διατελεῖ τὸν αἰωντὸν αἰωνα, they continue through all *eternity*. And this the ancients *properly expressed* by the word itself; for the consummation which contains the time of every one’s life, not supernatural, is called his *αιων*. For the very same reason, the consummation of the whole heaven, and that which contains the whole infinite duration and infinity of all things, is *αιων*, *eternity*, *από τὰ αἰεὶ εἰναὶ εἰληφθώς τὸν επωνυμιαν αἰωνάτος καὶ θεος*, taking its name from *always being*, *immortal* and *divine*.†

* Vol. II. p. 236.

† Aris. de cælo, lib. I. cap. 11.
p 3

When this word is applied to the present stage of human existence, it includes the *whole term* of the natural life of the individual of whom it is predicated. Thus, according to Mr. G., “The Apostle Paul says, I will not eat flesh *eis τον αιωνα*, for ever :”* that is during my natural life. But when it is applied to any beings as unconnected with the present limited duration, it is then used in speaking of beings whose duration is endless: and that state of those beings, the duration of which it is intended to mark, it indicates to be endless as their existence. This is the case in the following passages:—“If any one eat of this bread, he shall live [hereafter] *eis τον αιωνα*, for ever. †—We have heard out of the law, that the Christ remaineth *eis τον αιωνα*, for ever. ‡—His righteousness remaineth *eis τον αιωνα*, for ever. ||—Being born again not of corruptible seed, but of *incorrputible*, of the word of God which liveth and abideth *eis τον αιωνα*, for ever. §—The truth which shall be with us *eis τον αιωνα*, for ever.”¶—Now we call upon the Socinians to point out one single passage in which this phrase is applied to any being unconnected with this changing scene, in which it evidently defines a *limited* duration.

When this word is put in the plural with the same preposition, *eis τοις αιωνασ*, it does not imply “two eternities or two for-evers,” as Mr. G. shrewdly objects, in Vol. II. p. 220.; but includes both the present temporary and the future endless state. Let the Reader consider the following passages:—“The Creator who is blessed *eis τοις αιωνασ*, now and for ever ;” ** i. e. who is blessed by his creatures through their present temporary, and their future eternal state.—“Jesus Christ, who is over all God blessed *eis τοις αιωνασ*, now and for ever.”† But as this use of the word implies both the present *measured*, and the future *immeasurable* duration, it is never used in speaking of the punishment of the wicked. Yet from the use made of it in the places referred to, we may perceive that we have given the true meaning of the term, and that, as applied to a *future* duration, it still implies *eternity*.

* 1 Cor. viii. 13.

|| 2 Cor. ix. 9.

** Rom. 1. 25.

† John vi. 51, 58.

§ 1 Pet. i. 23.

** Rom. 1. 25.

‡ John xii. 34.

¶ 2 John 2.

†† Rom. ix. 25.

There is a third phrase, however, which differs from both these : it is, *eis τεσ αιωνας των αιωνων*, which is generally translated, “*for ever and ever*,” and might perhaps be rendered, “*through the durations of durations*.” This form of speech is very intelligible, and may be properly called *the superlative*. What is “*the holy of holies*,” but the *most holy*? What is “*the heaven of heavens*,” but the *highest heaven*? And what are “*the durations of durations*,” or, as some Socinians call them, “*the ages of ages*,” but that duration which is the *greatest* of all, that is *proper eternity*? This phrase is used only on the most important occasions, and to indicate an unlimited duration. It is used : (1.) To point out the eternity of the Most High : “He that sat on the throne who liveth *eis τεσ αιωνας των αιωνων*, for ever and ever.” See Rev. iv. 9, 10. v. 14. x. 6. xv. 7. (2.) To mark the endless duration of his government : “He shall reign *eis τεσ αιωνας των αιωνων*, for ever and ever.” See Rev. xi. 15. (3.) To indicate the everlasting praise which shall be rendered to him : “Blessing, honour, glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, *eis τεσ αιωνας των αιωνων*, for ever and ever.” See Rev. v. 13. vii. 12. (4.) To describe the endless duration of the blessedness of the righteous : “And they shall reign *eis τεσ αιωνας των αιωνων*, for ever and ever.” See Rev. xxii. 5. (5.) And finally, to describe the duration of the punishment of the wicked: “And her smoke rose up, *eis τεσ αιωνας των αιωνων*, for ever and ever.” See Rev. xiv. 11. xix. 3. xx. 10.

It is for the Socinians to shew where the Apostles have used this phrase, in a sense manifestly limited.

The adjective, *αιωνιος*, derives from the substantive, *αιων*, its abstract meaning, and therefore admits and requires a similar application. This word Mr. G. thinks should be rendered *lasting*, in conformity with what he deems the indefinite duration of an *αιων*. Had the word *αιωνιος*, been, in the view of the sacred writers, as indefinite as the word *lasting*, it could not have served their purpose. Nothing could be of greater importance in enforcing religion on the minds of mankind, than the difference between *time* and *eternity*. Nothing was more necessary to them, therefore,

than a definite term by which they might decisively distinguish between things *temporal* and things *eternal*. Any *periphrasis* had been better than a word the meaning of which was indefinite. But the meaning of the word *lasting* is perfectly indefinite, and may include either a long or a short period of time, and therefore it does not at all distinguish between those things which *have an end*, and those which *have no end*.

As the word *αιών* has a definite meaning, and, when applied to duration, always includes the whole period of that duration to which it refers,—and as when it refers to existence beyond this world, it always includes unmeasured duration,—the adjective also must have a definite meaning. With liberty, therefore, to make the same use of the translation which is made of the original, we cannot render it better than by the word *eternal*.

This is precisely and distinctly the sense in which it is used by the sacred writers, and it is therefore the very word which they have adopted to distinguish interminable duration from that which *has an end*. For instance: “Our light affliction, which is but for a *moment*, worketh out for us a far more exceeding and *αιωνίον, eternal* weight of glory.” Again: “For the things which are *seen* are *τηρούμενα, temporal*, but the things which are not seen are *αιωνία, eternal*.”* In these two places we find that *αιωνίος* is used to distinguish the things which *have no end*, from those which are indeed “*lasting*,” but not *everlasting*. If the word had not an independent power to make this distinction, it could not have answered the Apostle’s purpose.

This word, then, is used to announce the unlimited duration of things undoubtedly without limit. (1.) It is put for the endless duration of God himself. He is called *αιωνίος Θεός* “the *everlasting God*.”† (2.) The endless life and blessedness of the righteous is thereby defined. “When ye *fail* they may receive you *εἰς τὰς αἰωνίας σκηνάς*, into *everlasting habitations*.”‡ This passage is cited rather than many others, because it is obviously designed to distinguish between that which *fails*, and that which shall *not fail*.

* 2 Cor. iv. 17, 18.

¶ Rom. xvi. 26.

‡ Luke xvi. 9.

Again: "The God of all grace, who hath called us into his *αιωνιον*, *eternal glory*, after that ye have suffered, *αιρεσιν*, for a *short season*."* Here also the word is used to distinguish between that which is of short duration, and that which has no end. (3.) It is used to point out the duration of the punishment of the wicked, viz. in the passages already quoted, where it is translated, of course, *eternal* or *everlasting*. See Matt. xviii. 8. xxv. 41, 46, &c.

Mr. G. is aware that when these phrases are applied to God, and to the future blessedness of his saints, they mean an *eternity*. His opinion, however, is, that they "imply an indefinite duration which borrows its length from the subject to which they are applied."† If this were the case where is the sense of speaking so constantly of "lasting judgment, —"lasting damnation," "lasting fire," and "lasting punishment?" Here is an obvious design always to attach to these important things the idea of their duration. But the word, it seems by which this is done, is a word which makes no distinction between a *moment* and *eternity*. "It means *endless*, (says Mr. G.) only when the subject *absolutely requires*, and *evidently demonstrates*, that this *undefined* time, has not, and cannot have, any limit."‡ The length of that duration is, according to him, to be learned from the subject to which the epithet is applied. But what can we learn of the duration implied in the indefinite word *lasting*, from the subjects to which it is applied in the cases just now mentioned? What duration is to be understood from the subjects, *judgment*, *damnation*, *fire*, or *punishment*? None at all. So Jesus Christ and his Apostles are to be supposed to speak frequently of the *duration* of future punishment without giving us any idea whether it continue one day, a thousand years, or through eternal ages.—We have, however, abundant proof that the terms and phrases in question have a definite meaning, and that, *without eternal aid*, they have an *intrinsie power* to convey the idea of *proper eternity*. We appeal to the following passages.

(1.) Of the phrase *εἰς τὸν αἰώνα*, for ever.—"We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth *εἰς τὸν αἰώνα*, for

* 1 Pet. v. 10.

† Vol. II. p. 224.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 224.

ever ; and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lift up? *—And the servant abideth not in the house *eis τὸν αἰώνα*, for ever : but the Son abideth *eis τὸν αἰώνα*, for ever. †—And the world *passeth away*, and the lust thereof : but he that doeth the will of God abideth *eis τὸν αἰώνα*, for ever.” ‡—These passages need no comment. In each of them the phrase is used, independently of all circumstances, to decide the question of the *eternity* of the *subject*, in direct opposition to a limited duration.

(2.) Of the phrase *eis τὸς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων*, for ever and ever.—“ And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth *eis τὸς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων*, for ever and ever.” ||—Here we have no mean of ascertaining who it is whom they worshipped, but that he *liveth for ever and ever*. The phrase must therefore contain *in itself* a declaration of a proper eternity, *independent* of the *subject*.

(3.) Of the epithet *αἰώνιος*, eternal.—“ The things which are seen are *temporal*; but the things which are not seen, are *αἰώνια*, *eternal*.” §—Here again the word in question is used, independently to distinguish a *proper eternity*, from a *limited* duration. Will Mr. G. say, ‘ But the things which are not seen are naturally endless?’ Then why all this dispute? Are not the future punishments of the wicked *unseen*, and are not they too *eternal*?

The above remarks are confirmed by the authorities, which Mr. G. has produced for a very different purpose.

“ Parkhurst observes that *æon*, in the Septuagint, generally answers to the Hebrew *olam*, which denotes ‘ time hidden from man,’ whether definite or indefinite, whether past or future.”—He then quotes Leigh upon the Hebrew term *olam*.—1. “ The Hebrew word *gnolum*, which interpreters sometimes render *æternum*, sometimes *perpetuum*, sometimes *sæculum*, designs an *absolute perpetuity, eternity*, when it is affirmed of God, or *other eternal things*.” ¶—Here then it is granted, that when these words are applied to men in the world to come, where men are *eternal*, it implies “ an abso-

* John xii. 34. † John viii. 35.

|| Rev. v. 14. § 2 Cor. iv. 18. ¶ Vol. II. p. 215. 216,

‡ 1 John ii. 17.

lute eternity."—2. "A periodical or circumscribed *perpetuity*, for the condition of the thing, when it is affirmed of things mutable in their own nature."*—This is precisely what we contend for: (1.) That when these phrases are used concerning present things, they comprehend the *whole* of their present existence: (2.) That when they are used concerning things future, they comprehend the *whole* of their future existence.

We now attend to Mr. G.'s objections:

1. All his arguments drawn from the application of these terms to *present things*, prove nothing with respect to their application to the *world to come*. A volume of quotations, therefore, of this kind, answer no purpose. The Reader will best understand this reply, if he consider that the phrase "*as long as you live*," when applied to any individual, is equivalent to the term $\alpha\omega\gamma$. Now this phrase when applied to the present life, means a limited period; but this does not hinder that when applied to the future state of human existence, it should imply an *unlimited* period, an *eternity*.

2. There is no weight in the objection taken from the use of the *plural*. † It is true, there can only be *one* eternity; but there have been, and there may still be, many *æons in time*. Every divine dispensation is an *æon*, and every man's natural life is his *æon*; but the dispensation of rewards and punishments, and the future life of all men, is but *one æon*,—an *eternity*.

3. Nor is there any strength in the objection, that "the words in the original admit of a *preposition*; as $\pi\rho\chi\rho\omega\pi\alpha\omega\pi\alpha\omega\pi\alpha\omega$ ";‡ because the word $\alpha\omega\pi\alpha\omega$, we have already granted, does not, when it is applied to things in this world, properly mean eternal. Our translators have, therefore, very justly translated that phrase, "before the world began." On this this answer we rely. The preposition $\pi\rho\chi$, is, however, sometimes put for $\pi\alpha\rho\chi$, which with a *genitive* case, means *from*.

4. "But the words in the original admit of a particle *following* them, which denotes a time *after* that denomina-

* Vol. II. p. 216.

† Vol. II. p. 220.

‡ Vol. II. p. 221.

ted everlasting. ‘The Lord shall reign for ever and ever;’ literally according to the Septuagint, ‘from *æon* to *æon* and *further*.’”* To this we answer; (1.) That the words do not need any particle to add to their meaning; as we have already shewn. (2.) The writers of the New Testament do not make use of any such particle, even when their purpose is to speak of eternity in the most absolute manner. (3.) The use of such a particle does not prove, that a proper eternity is not expressed without it. We often say ‘for evermore;’ but this does not prove that we mean by ‘for ever,’ a limited duration.

5. Lastly,—“The very strongest expressions,” for ever and ever, “are used to denote limited duration.”†—We will examine the passages which Mr. G. has cited in proof of this.

(1.) “So shall I keep thy law continually, for ever and ever, during my life. Psalm exix. 44.”

Now, how is it proved that the Psalmist does not keep the law of God, literally, *for ever and ever*?

(2.) “He hath also stablished them [the heavens] for ever and ever. Psalm exlviii. 6. Yet, says the Apostle Peter, are the heavens ‘reserved unto fire, and shall pass away with a great noise.’ 2 Peter iii. 7, 10.”‡

The question is, “Does the Psalmist speak this of the *visible* or of the *invisible* heavens? Which soever way this question is answered, it will not make against the preceding statement. But the difficulty of answering this question, renders this passage a very improper one for determining another question on either side.

The attentive and judicious Reader will observe, that throughout the whole of this examination, we have found the words in dispute to be uniformly used according to the rule at first laid down, without one exception. It remains therefore that our Translators, who were not so ignorant of

* Vol. II. p. 221.

† Vol. II. p. 222.

‡ Thanks to Mr. G. for this concession! So the heavens which are to be destroyed and renewed, are the *visible heavens*. Jesus Christ then, who “maketh all things new,” will create a “new heaven and a new earth.” He is therefore a *proper*, and not merely a *moral*, *Creator*. See p. 70—73.

Greek as the Socinians insinuate, have given the proper meaning of them, and that whenever those words are applied to the invisible world, or to the world to come, they uniformly express a *proper eternity*.

That this is equally true in respect to future *punishments*, as in respect to future *rewards*, will be further obvious from the *antithetical* connection of the one with the other. “Some shall awake to *everlasting life*, and some to shame and *everlasting contempt*.^{*} “These shall go away into *everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into *everlasting life*.[†] These *antitheses* would be very improper, unless the word were allowed to mean the same duration in both parts of the sentence.

But Mr. G. translates the word *αιώνιος*, *lasting*; and maintains, that, in both parts of the passage, this is its proper meaning. The *life* of the righteous he believes to be *everlasting*, not because it is termed *aeonian*; but because, in other passages he meets with assertions, such as the following:—“Neither *can they die any more*:—It (the body) is raised in *incorruption*:—This mortal must put on *immortality*:—So shall we be *παντοτε*, *ever* with the Lord:—An inheritance that *fadeth not away*:” &c. ‡—We do not intend to argue precisely in the same manner. It has been proved that the word here means *everlasting*. We shall now shew, That the doctrine of *eternal punishment* agrees with the general scope of Divine revelation. This argument divides itself into several parts, each of which will be found to bear on this general truth.

1. According to the uniform tenor of scripture, the present life is the time of probation, and the time for working out our salvation.—The following passages will serve to prove this.

“To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart, as in the provocation, and in the day of temptation in the wilderness: when your fathers tempted me, proved me, and saw my works. ||—Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no

* Dan. xiii. 2.

† Matt. xxv. 46.

|| Psalm. xcvi. 7—11

‡ Vol. II. p. 217.

* Heb. iii. 7—11

work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest.*—Seek ye the Lord *while he may be found*, call ye upon him *while he is near.*† We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also, that ye receive not the grace of God in vain: For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, *now is the accepted time:* behold *now is the day of salvation.*‡—Come, for all things are *now* ready. ||—Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth [here] that shall he reap [hereafter.] For he that soweth to his *flesh* [which he can do only while he is here, *in the flesh,*] shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. And let us not be weary in well-doing; for in due season, [in the time of harvest] we shall reap, if we faint not [in seed-time.] As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men [before the opportunity slip,] especially unto them who are of the household of faith.” § A clear proof that this is the time to sow to the Spirit, while yet we are connected, not only with “the household of faith,” but with “*all men.*”

2. As this is the time to work out our salvation, it is the *only* time; and they who neglect it will be excluded from the kingdom of heaven. Such is the language of the following passages:

“So I swear in my wrath, *They shall not enter into my rest.*—And to whom swaré he, that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see they could not enter in because of unbelief. Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to [should actually] come short of it. ¶—And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came, and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and *the door was shut.* Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. **—Then said one

* Eccles. ix. 10.

|| Luke xiv. 17.

† Isa. iv. 6.

§ Gal. vi. 7—10.

‡ 2 Cor. vi. 1, 2.

¶ Heb. iii. 11, 12, 19. iv. 1.

** Matt. xxvi. 11, 12.

unto him, Are there few that be saved? And he said unto them, Strive to enter in at the strait gate: for many, I say unto you, will seek to enter in, and shall not be able. When once the Master of the house is risen up, and hath *shut to the door*, and ye begin to stand without, and to knock at the door, saying, Lord, Lord, open unto us; and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are: Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. *—Looking diligently, lest any man *fail of the grace of God*, lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birth-right. For ye know how that afterward, when he *would have inherited the blessing*, he was rejected: for he found no *place of repentance*, though he sought it carefully with tears. †—He that believeth not the Son *shall not see life*; but the wrath of God *abideth* on him. ‡—I say unto you, That *none* of those men which were bidden [and refused to come] shall taste of my supper. ||—I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: whither I go, ye cannot come. §—If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in *this thy day*, the things which belong unto thy peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes. ¶—Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?— But who are these “unrighteous” persons? They whose sins are such as can only be committed in this life, and whom the Apostle proceeds to describe thus: “Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.” **—“He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still.” ††

Now the Socinian doctrine with which these passages are contrasted, supposes that there is another season of probation, when the present shall be at an end, and that they

* Luke xiii. 23—24. † Heb. xii. 16, 17. ‡ John iii. 36. || Luke xiv. 24.
§ John viii. 21. ¶ Luke xix. 42. ** 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. †† Rev. xxii. 11,

who neglect the present, and die in their sins, shall after all find *place for repentance*;—that they shall be able to *enter in*;—that they *shall taste of the supper*;—that they *shall see life*;—and that they shall *finally inherit the kingdom of God*. So true it is that *Christianity* is one thing, and *Socinianism* another.*

3. The punishment of the wicked is often described in such a manner as is altogether inconsistent with their “final restoration to virtue and happiness.”

(1.) The following passages describe their punishment under the idea of *burning*:

“ Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner; but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. †—Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn. ‡—For it is impossible for them who were once enlightened, and shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God; but that which beareth thorns and briars is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned.” ||

These appropriate representations of the nature and design of future punishment, are very unfavourable to the Socinian system. The burning of chaff or of tares, is the way to *destroy* them; but not to *convert* them into *wheat*. In like manner, the burning of barren and “rejected” ground with the scorching heat of the sun, and cursing it with more than the want of that “blessing from God,” is not the way to render it fruitful. And this is the very case which the Apostle has described, the giving up to perpetual

* To these might properly be subjoined those passages which declare that the wicked have their portion in this life. See Psalm xvii. 14. Luke vi. 24. xvi. 25.

There are certain passages which speak of some sins which cannot be forgiven; but as these are not directly opposed to Mr. G.’s hypothesis, they are not here quoted under that head. The following are of the number. Heb. vi. 4. x. 26, 27. Luke xii. 10. Mark iii. 28, 29. Matt. xii. 31, 32.

† Matt. iii. 12.

‡ Matt. xiii. 30.

|| Heb. vi. 4—8.

barrenness, a tract of land which has been cultivated to no purpose ; or, in other words, the giving up to destruction, and to a curse, those whom it is “impossible to renew again to repentance.”

(2.) The following passages describe the punishment of the wicked, under the idea of *destruction*.

“ Wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction.*—The vessels of wrath fitted for destruction. †—Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction.” ‡

It is easy to see that the idea of *destruction* is perfectly irreconcilable with the idea of everlasting *blessedness*, and that destruction is a very unlikely mean to restore mankind to virtue and bliss. Yet this is the doctrine which we oppose, viz. “ that the *object* of punishment is still to guide them to reformation and happiness.” || Destruction is as likely to restore the sick to health, as the sinner to holiness.

(3.) The following passages describe the punishment of the wicked, under the idea of *perdition*.

“ None of them is lost, but the son of perdition. §—For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul ? ¶—If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them which are lost.” **

Now if the wicked in hell endure only a *fatherly chastisement*, they are no more *lost* than those whose diseases are *not incurable*, and who have fallen into the hands of a skilful and affectionate physician : they are rather *found* than *lost*. At this rate, to *fall* is to *rise* ; *ruin* is *recovery* ; *damnation* is *salvation* ; and *perdition* is *restoration*. It is true, “ The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was *lost*.” “ A man may be *lost* in *desert*, and yet *saved* in *fact* : or he may *suffer loss*, and yet *himself* be saved : but he cannot be *lost* (*in fact*) so as to be *cast away*, and yet be finally saved ; for these are perfect contraries.” †† It is also true, that “ he that *loses* his life shall *find* it ;” that is, he that loses his *natural* life for the sake of Christ, shall not, in the

* Matt. vii. 13.

† Rom. ix. 22.

‡ 2 Thess. i. 9.

|| Vol. II. p. 200.

§ John xvii. 12.

¶ Matt. xvi. 26.

** 2 Cor. iv. 3.

†† Fuller's 4th Letter to Vidler.

end, be a loser ; because an *eternal* life shall be his reward. But is it not equally true that “whosoever will save his life shall lose it ?” in other words, that whoever preserves his *natural* life by the neglect of his duty, shall lose it, and shall find no reward in the life to come, but shall lose *eternal* life ?

(4.) The following passages describe future punishment under the idea of *death*.

“ The wages of sin is death. *—Knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death. †—Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death. ‡—He that converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death. ||—The lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire.” §

By what mode of argumentation is it to be proved that *death* is the mean of *life* ? It is true, there is a *first death* which is followed by a *first resurrection*, and over those who partake that resurrection, “ the second death hath no power.” But Mr. G. stands engaged to prove, not only that *death* shall be *followed* by *life*—that there will be a *second resurrection* of those who are cast into the lake of fire, which is the *second death*,—but that the *second death* is the mean by which that resurrection shall be accomplished. If there be any meaning in words, if *burning*, *destruction*, *perdition*, and *death*, mean any thing, they cannot mean a *salutary* and *temporary chastisement*.

Upon these, and such terms as these, Mr. G. thinks no enlargement necessary. “ If these terms are to be taken *literally*, (he says) they are directly opposite to *eternal duration* in torture : nor can any hyperbole of figure make them accord with it.” ¶

(1.) Mr. G. evidently thinks that these terms involve the idea of *annihilation*. This is a gross mistake. Combustion may dissolve the present construction of any combustible matter, but does not annihilate it. A building may be *destroyed* ; but the materials of it are not thereby *annihilated*.

* Rom. vi. 23.

† Rom. i. 32.

‡ James i. 15.

|| James v. 20.

§ Rev. xx. 14, 15.

¶ Vol. II. p. 210.

The *loss* of any thing is not the *annihilation* of it. A man may be lost in a wilderness, in a pit, or in the country of an enemy, and be extremely wretched, who does not therefore lose his existence. *Death* is not annihilation: it may put an end to the beauty, the vigour, the enjoyment of the body, but cannot reduce it to *nothing*.

(2.) Mr. G. must either apply these terms to the *nature* of the punishment of the wicked, or to the *result* and *conclusion* of it. If he apply them to the *nature* of it, let it be remembered that according to him it is a *lasting* punishment; but on whatever principles he supposes the meaning of them to be reconciled with *any* duration, on the same principles it is reconcilable with *endless* duration. If a lasting punishment may with propriety be termed a *lasting burning*, a *lasting destruction*, a *lasting perdition*, or a *lasting death*,—an “*everlasting punishment*” may with equal propriety be termed an “*everlasting burning*;” an “*everlasting destruction*,” an *everlasting perdition*, or an *everlasting death*.—If, on the other hand, Mr. G. apply these terms to the *result* and *conclusion* of future punishment,* he cannot reconcile them with “*final reformation* and *happiness*;” because to be *burned in hell* is not to be *blessed in heaven*;—*destruction* is not *restoration*;—*perdition* is not *salvation*;—and *death* is not *everlasting life*.

4. The future punishment of the wicked is frequently represented as *without remedy*.

“ He that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy. †—Because there is wrath, beware, lest he take thee away with his stroke, then a great ransom cannot deliver thee. ‡—He shall have judgment without mercy, that hath shewed no

* It is not easy to say which of these opinions he adopts. Perhaps he adopts either, *pro tempore*, just as serves a present purpose. On one occasion, he says, When “it is most peremptorily affirmed that the wicked shall reap corruption, perish, be destroyed, and die a second time,” these expressions “fix the sense of the word *lasting*, limiting its meaning to *an age*.” Vol. II. p. 223. In another place he says, “The second death is to constitute their *state of suffering*.” Vol. II. p. 273. But inconsistency is the necessary result of want of system, and of opposition to the doctrines of the gospel.

† Prov. xxix. 1.

Q 2

‡ Job xxxvi. 18.

mercy *—Because I have called, and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded ; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof ; I also will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh. When your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind ; when distress and anguish cometh upon you ; then shall they call upon me, *but I will not answer* : they shall seek me early, but *they shall not find me.* †—And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulph fixed : so that they which would pass from hence cannot ; *neither can they pass to us that would come from thence.*" ‡

The following passages of the same order will need a little examination.

" He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire. ||—If thy hand offend thee, cut it off : it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched : where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." § The same words are twice repeated. Here are two strong expressions, the one asserting that the fire is *unquenchable* ; the other that it is *not quenched*.—Now let us hear Mr. G.

(1.) " Here it is obvious to remark, that the duration is asserted not of the *sufferer*, but of the *instruments* of his suffering or punishment. It is not said that the person of the culprit shall never perish, but that the *fire* and the *worm* died not, being ever in constant readiness to seize their victim." ¶

" Here it is obvious to remark :" [1.] That when Mr. G. states, " It is not said that the person of the culprit shall *never perish*," he speaks ambiguously. Does he mean to say that " the person of the culprit shall be *annihilated* ?" Then what becomes of his " final reformation and happiness." [2.] That he grants, " the *fire* and the *worm* died not." [3.] That he grants, " they are EVER in CONSTANT readiness to seize their victim :" but to what purpose when

* James ii. 13.

† Prov. i. 24—28.

‡ Luke xvi. 26.

|| Mat. iii. 12.

§ Mark ix. 43, 44, &c.

¶ Vol. II. p. 232.

they have no victim to seize? [4.] That the worm and the fire remain for no purpose, if “the culprit” do not continue to feel them. They are no longer “the instruments of punishment,” when no one is punished by them; nor can they be any longer terrible than while the “culprit” is likely to suffer by them. At this rate, the *never-dying* worm, and the *unquenchable* fire, are but a chimera. [5.] That our Lord denominated the worm, *their* worm. But it cannot be denominated *their* worm, any longer than it preys upon *them*. [6.] That the analogy between the representative and the thing represented, is lost, unless the worm die soon after it has devoured or lost its prey, and unless the fire be quenched when its fuel is consumed. Now our Lord indubitably intended to represent the culprit as the prey of the worm, and the chaff as the fuel of the fire. If, therefore, the worm die not, the sinner will continue its prey; and if the fire be not quenched, the chaff will continue to be its fuel.

(2.) “It should be kept in mind, (Mr. G. subjoins) that the duration even of these instruments of punishment was not eternal, but only for a length of ages, for the worm is dead, and the fire has actually been quenched.” *

Then let the transgressors rejoice and be exceeding glad! There is now no danger of everlasting fire; for “the length of ages” is already past.—But stop! Has not Mr. G. just been saying that “the fire and the worm *didc not*, being *ever* in *constant readiness* to seize their victim?” What wonder then, that he should boldly contradict *Jesus Christ*, when he does not even reverence *himself*? Our Lord has said, “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, he shall sit upon the throne of his glory, and shall say unto them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.” *That* fire therefore is *not yet* quenched.

(3.) “But hell-fire ($\gamma\epsilon\pi\pi\alpha\tau\alpha\omega\pi\rho\sigma$, the hell of fire) is the fire in the valley of *Hinnom*.” †

No, it is not. The phrase may be used in allusion to that fire, but hell-fire is “the lake of fire which is the

* Vol. II. p. 232.

† Vol. II. p. 211.

second death :” “ the fire prepared for the devil and his angels.” The fire of that valley is long ago quenched ; but our Lord threatens the wicked with another hell of fire. “ Whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of *την γεενναν τος πυρος*, the *hell of fire.*” * See also Matt. v. 29. x. 28. Luke xii. 5. Luke xxiii. 33.—And *that* is the fire which our Lord declares shall *not be quenched*.

(4.) “ But the expression is taken from the last verse of the prophecy of Isaiah, where the prophet predicts the dispersion of the Jews, and the new æra, or Christian dispensation, into which the Gentiles were to be admitted.” †

That the words of Isaiah have no deeper meaning than the temporal destruction of the unbelieving Jews, wants some proof. It is generally more proper to interpret the language of the Prophets by that of our Lord, than to interpret the words of our Lord by those of the Prophets. But whatever the Prophet meant, the meaning of our Lord is obvious. The latter, when he speaks of the never-dying worm, and the unquenchable fire, makes a contrast between “ entering into *life*,” or, as he afterwards speaks, “ entering into the kingdom of God,” and being “ cast into hell-fire : where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.”—We need not add, that the unquenchable fire, in which the chaff shall be burned, is not a *temporal* but a *future* punishment.—We proceed to the consideration of the next :

“ The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him : but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed ! It had been good for that man if he had not been born.” ‡

The argument commonly founded on these words, is plain and conclusive. If Judas should, at any future period, be restored to “ virtue and *eternal* happiness,” as there is no assignable proportion between time and eternity, it would be good for him that he was born. The words of our Lord are, therefore, perfectly inconsistent with such a restoration.

Mr. G. is aware of this, and therefore does not deny that the argument is conclusive, but attempts to remove the foundation of it by a new translation of the passage. The

* Matt. v. 22.

+ Vol. II. 233.

‡ Matt. xxvi. 24.

literal translation, he says, is, “Good were it for *him*, if *that man* had not been born.”—He then applies the expression, “*that man*,” not to Judas but “to Jesus.”* If this be just, the argument falls of course. But it falls *alone*. We beg leave, however, to demur.

(1.) Our Lord begins with speaking of himself, as “the Son of man;” but of Judas he speaks in the first instance, as “*that man*.” When he speaks of himself a second time, he still styles himself “the Son of man.” When therefore he speaks of “*that man*” a second time, he means not himself whom throughout he styles “the Son of man,” but of Judas, of whom he had begun to speak as “*that man*.”

(2.) When Mr. G. began to translate the passage *literally*, he ought to have done so altogether. It would then stand thus:—“Good it were *αὐτῷ*, for *himself*, if *that man* had not been born.” The sense is then precisely what our Translators have given. They have changed only the idiom. So true it is that those men *once* understood Greek.

5. Lastly, The state of *punishment* is represented as the *final* state of impenitent sinners.

“Ye have obeyed from the heart (says St. Paul to the Romans) that form of doctrine which was delivered you.—Now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness; and the *end*, everlasting life.”† But “what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?”‡ The answers are ready: Their end shall “be according to their works. ||—Whose end is to be burned. §—Whose *end* is destruction. ¶—For the end of these things is death.”**—No argument is necessary here but that of Mr. G., who says, “We are *absolutely obliged*, if the *next* state is *final*, as we would not set the scripture at odds with itself, to understand the word *αονιαν*, ‘everlasting,’ when joined with the life of the righteous, [or the death of the wicked,] in the endless sense.”††

The result of all this reasoning is, that the future punishment of the wicked, according to the uniform language of scripture, will be *eternal*. To this result, though not

* Vol. II. p. 231. † Rom. vi. 17, 22. ‡ 1 Pet. iv. 17. || 2 Cor. xi. 15.
§ Heb. vi. 8. ¶ Phil. iii. 19. ** Rom. vi. 21. †† Vol. II. p. 227.

only fairly deduced from scripture, but directly and repeatedly affirmed by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, Mr. G. and the Socinians have many objections. However we may be persuaded that it is founded in truth, we must examine how far it is affected by his assault. His objections are of two kinds: the first are philosophical, the second are scriptural. As we do not allow to abstract reasonings on divine subjects that importance which Mr. G. attaches to them, we shall consider,

I. His scriptural objections.

1. In examining what the scriptures teach concerning a future state, Mr. G. pursues the subject much at length, and with considerable propriety, until he finds the wicked finally separated from the righteous, and “cast into a lake of fire, which is the *second death*.”* He then with vast, but fruitless, labour endeavours to prove, that as the first death is followed by a resurrection, there will also be a *second resurrection*, of those who are “hurt by the second death.” Now for the proof, which must be clear and cogent. We follow him step by step.

“The terms used relating to this second death, are precisely the same [as are used concerning the death of the body] and many of them imply *another resurrection*.”†—The proof!—“The principal term used is ‘fire.’ Now the effect of fire, as generally used in comparison, is to *purify*.”‡—Sometimes it is; but not always. It depends upon the nature of the subject to be burned. “Gold, silver, and precious stones” are purified in the fire; but “wood, hay, and stubble” are consumed by it. The question therefore is, Do the scriptures ever borrow their ideas of *the punishments of hell* from the purification of any thing by fire? Mr. G. will find the passage if possible.—“When therefore the wicked are compared to ‘fuel for fire,’ to chaff, tares, withered branches, &c., it should be kept in mind, that such fuel neither continues burning without end, nor is annihilated. Its state is changed by the action of the fire.”||—Sensible men know that a proof derived from a scriptural metaphor, pursued beyond the line to which the scriptures pursue it,

* Vol. II. p. 272, 273. † Vol. II. p. 273. ‡ Vol. II. p. 274. || Vol. II. p. 274.

is always at best but of a dubious kind. It is an universal rule that the metaphor, however far pursued, must not be changed. For this reason we ask, Did any man ever think of making worthless wood "fuel for fire," to render it fit for building a temple? of burning chaff or tares, to convert them into wheat? or of casting "withered branches" into the fire, to make them fruitful? Yet on such a distortion of scriptural metaphors, hangs all the hope which Mr. G. administers to the damned!

But he proceeds: "The very expression of a first resurrection, implies a second resurrection of those over whom the second death hath power."*—The book of Revelation does speak of a second resurrection; but not of a resurrection of the damned from hell. In Rev. xx. 6. it is said, "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." After these thousand years are expired comes the second resurrection: verses 13, 14, 15. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and HADES delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And whosoever was not written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire.—This is the second death."—So the second death follows the second resurrection,—the resurrection of *all* the dead. Where now is the resurrection from the second death to be found?—But "the *state* also in which they are placed, is to undergo a similar change."†—Not so. The *state from which* they are brought to judgment —"death and hades" which deliver up the dead, "are cast into the *lake of fire*, which is the *second death*." But when is the *lake of fire* to be cast into the *lake of fire*? When is the second death to die? Rev. xx. 13—15.—"This will constitute the supreme and last victory of Jesus Christ."‡—Not the destruction of the lake of fire, but of the *first death*, and of *hades*. Mr. G. alludes to 1 Cor. xv. Now the whole of that chapter speaks of the resurrection of the bodies of "those who are Christ's at his coming." "When this mortal [body] shall have put on immortality, then shall be

* Vol. II. p. 274.

† Vol. II. p. 275.

‡ Vol. II. p. 276.

brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting ? O *ἀδη*, where is thy victory”*—This chapter therefore shuts up the damned in despair, for “the *last* enemy that shall be destroyed is [the *first*] death.” But the lake of fire into which that is cast, the *second death*, still remains.—Now Mr. G. may “know how these positive assurances are parried, and the argument evaded ;”† and that this defeat decides the fate of Socinianism.

2. He does not think it necessary to argue much from scripture authority, on the divine attributes of wisdom, justice, and goodness, because he is so much more at home in arguing *philosophically* on such topics. He condescends, however, to remind us that it is an eminent Christian duty to “imitate the *unconfined benevolence* of Deity.”‡—We will take for granted that by “unconfined benevolence,” he means benevolence to all men. But why no mention of the imitation of his justice? We acknowledge that Jesus Christ has said, “Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father is merciful. Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.” Mr. G. certainly does not suppose that all judgment of each other is to be avoided, any more than that God promises that we shall in no sense be judged. We are forbidden to judge and condemn each other, (1.) because we cannot always judge aright, and may possibly condemn the innocent. (2.) because we have not authority to judge and condemn, but ought to refer many things to the Judge of all. “Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath, for it is written, Vengeance is mine, I will repay.”|| Our being forbidden to take vengeance, does not imply that God will not, but rather that he will, take vengeance. There are, however, proper persons, who ought to imitate, in their sphere, even the justice of God: “the ministers of God, who bear not the sword in vain; revengers to (execute) wrath upon him that doeth evil.”§ These are taught to administer retributive justice, in distant imitation of “the Judge of all the earth.”

* 1 Cor. xv. 54—57. † Vol. II. p. 278. ‡ Vol. II. p. 279, 280.

|| Rom. 12. xix.

§ Rom. xiii. 4.

3. Mr. G. next “considers some of the parables of our Saviour.”—“The person who is not reconciled to his brother, shall not be discharged *till he has paid* the last farthing.”*—Certainly a debtor cannot in justice be imprisoned any longer than while his debt is paid. When therefore our sins are spoken of under the idea of debts, such language must be held. But then the imprisonment of a debtor, however long it may continue, does nothing towards the payment of his debt. It therefore lies upon Mr. G., if he argue thus, to shew by what means a debtor in the prison of hell, is to pay the debt of sin. The truth is, that his inference is only the abuse of a metaphor. Our Lord has nowhere spoken of the actual payment of the debt of sinners, nor of their release from punishment; but has, in this metaphorical language, assured us that a sinner shall receive the punishment due to his crimes. Of the duration or end of that punishment, he has here said nothing.

“Dives is represented as immediately beginning to *improve* as soon as his punishment commences.”†—Is this perfectly clear from his wishing “his brethren to be warned?” Not unless it can be made to appear, that before that time he *wished* them to go to that place of torment. Might not this wish proceed, as is generally supposed, from an apprehension that the perdition of his brethren would increase his misery? But if Mr. G.’s hypothesis be just, Dives must by this time be so much *improved* as to have passed the impassable gulf. The truth is, that the conclusion is perfectly arbitrary, and that Mr. G. administers to Dives a consolation which father Abraham refused. That which Mr. G. administers, would have been more than a *drop* of water to cool his tongue.

4. Again: “The punishments of the Jews are represented as evils tending to produce greater good in themselves.”‡—One example, at least, might have been given, that we might judge whether they were punishments or chastisements. We give one of an opposite kind: “And men were scorched with great heat, and *blasphemed the name of God*, which hath power over these plagues; and *repented not* to

* Vol. II. p. 280. † Vol. II. p. 281. ‡ Vol. II. p. 281. || Rev. xvi. 9.

give him glory." ||—Nay, we can find such an example among the Jews: "Why should ye be stricken any more? Ye will revolt more and more." *—But if, on the other hand, a thousand instances could be given, of the benefits accruing from the *chastisement* of those who are in a state of probation, they would prove just nothing with respect to the effects of the punishment of those who are gone to the place of retribution.

5. Mr. G. has quoted Rom. v. 12—21. the sum of which is, "Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin reigned unto death, so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ." —He has deduced no argument from it, but undoubtedly expects the Reader to infer from it, that every soul must be finally restored. The Reader will draw his inference just according to his previous opinion. We observe, however: (1.) That as all the blessings mentioned in this passage depend upon "Jesus Christ," they cannot belong to those who "deny the Lord that bought them, and bring on themselves swift destruction." (2.) That the blessings here described belong to those who "receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness." (verse 17.) But what does this prove concerning those who "receive the grace of God in vain;" † and who "have not submitted to the righteousness [which is the gift] of God?" ‡ (3.) That one of the blessings here mentioned, is, "of many offences into justification," (verse 16.) or "*justification of life.*" (verse 18.) But what does that prove concerning those who die in their sins, and are finally condemned to the *second death*; who "shall not see life;" || in a word, whom Mr. G. supposes not to be *justified*, but to be finally *condemned*? (4.) That one of the blessings here mentioned is, that certain persons "shall much more reign in *life* by one, Jesus Christ," (verse 17.) whereas, Mr. G. himself grants that the wicked, at the best, shall *much less* reign in life: that they will be "*for ever excluded from the society of the righteous.*" §—So much easier was it for Mr. G. to quote this passage, than to extract from it his doctrine!

* Isa. i. 5.

† 2 Cor. vi. 1.
|| John iii. 36.

‡ Rom. x. 3.

§ Vol. II. p. 278.

6. Mr. G. next attempts to establish the doctrine of universal restoration. For this purpose he quotes the following scriptures.

(1.) Rom. viii. 12—23.—St. Paul says, that “the creature itself shall be delivered *from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.*” These are the words which Mr. G. marks as *emphatical*. Now he says that “the wicked will be *for ever excluded from the society of the righteous*, the Christian society.”* If so, they cannot be restored to “the glorious liberty of the children of God.” The passage does not, therefore, and cannot refer to them. Nor can it, by any fair means, be made to support any scheme of universal salvation or restoration. The Apostle speaks of the accomplishment of this deliverance, as taking place on “the manifestation of the sons of God.” (verse 19.) This manifestation he calls “the *adoption*, to wit, the redemption of our body.” (verse 23.) Now the time of the redemption of the bodies of the saints, is previous to the universal judgment; and therefore cannot be justly supposed to be the time of universal restoration.—Perhaps the passage is best explained by the words of St. Peter, where he speaks of “the production of new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.”†

(2.) “That all things might be gathered in one Christ.”‡—For the reason just mentioned, this passage cannot answer Mr. G.’s purpose. The wicked are not to be made one society (body,) with the righteous. Besides this, St. Paul’s words are, “That in the *fulness of times*, αναφελαιωταις, he may bring all things again under a head, or sum up all things, in Christ, whether things in *heaven*, or things on *earth*.|| Now the *fulness of times* are the times of the gospel dispensation. “When the *fulness of time* was come, God sent forth his Son.”§ Again: The Apostle makes no mention of things in *hell*; but only of things in *heaven*, and on *earth*.

* Vol. II. p. 274. † 2 Pet. iii. 13. ‡ Vol. II. p. 241. || Eph. i. 10.

§ Gal. iv. 1.

(3.) “ I saw every creature in heaven, in earth, under the earth, and in the sea, and all that were in them, praising God.”*—Is this to prove that instead of “ weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth,” both men and devils will praise God in hell? This would be an *innovation* in the kingdom of darkness! But creatures in *hell* are not mentioned. If this be not the design with which it is cited, it cannot answer Mr. G.’s purpose.

Before we proceed, the Reader will remark that the advocates for the limitation of future punishment, generally distinguish between universal *restoration*, and universal *salvation*. Mr. G. has now declared himself for *restoration*. We must not, however, look for consistency. He endeavours to take every advantage of those scriptures which speak of the *salvation* of mankind. The scriptural term, *salvation*, has a meaning very different from that which Mr. G. wishes to attach to it. To be *saved*, in scripture, is the reverse of being *condemned*. “ He that believeth shall be *saved*; but he that believeth not shall be *damned*.”† But our opponent means by it a perfectly different thing,—a restoration to virtue and happiness, subsequent to the execution of a sentence of righteous condemnation. After this observation we proceed :

(4.) “ God our Saviour who will have *all* men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth.”‡—How does it appear that this passage relates to the damned in hell? Are they saved or damned? Does not St. Paul explain himself, when, in the context, he calls on his brethren to “ pray for all men (on earth,) that they may be saved,” and declares that “ for this purpose he was appointed a preacher and an apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles, in faith and truth;” viz. that they might be brought to the knowledge of the truth?—But if Mr. G.’s works correspond with his faith, he has undoubtedly revived the *prayers for the dead*, and labours incessantly to obtain for his departed friends a deliverance from purgatory.

(5.) “ The glad tidings are proclaimed to every creature which is under heaven.”||—True: and “ he that believeth

* Vol. II. p. 285. † Mark xvi. 16. ‡ Vol. II. p. 282. || Vol. II. p. 234.

and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.” *

(6.) “To make all men see the fellowship of the mystery, which had been hidden.” †—For this purpose, Paul says, “This grace was given to him, to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ :” ‡ but certainly not in hell. Where is that written?

(7.) “To reconcile *all* things to himself.” ||—The Apostle continues, “whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven;” § but of things in HELL he says nothing.

(8.) “The grace of God, which bringeth *salvation*, hath appeared to *all* men.” ¶—This passage would much better prove that all men will be saved on earth, than that they will be restored from hell; for on earth the Apostle’s words have their accomplishment. Witness those which follow: “Teaching that denying *worldly* lusts, we should live *soberly*.” And again: “Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God,” &c. In a word, the Apostle says, “the grace of God [not shall appear, but] *hath* appeared to all men.” **

(9.) “Christ is declared able to subdue all things to himself.” ††—He is. But where is the proof, [1.] that the Apostle speaks of willing subjection? and [2.] that he *will* do all that he is *able* to do? When God hath judged the great whore, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand,—“a great multitude as the voice of many waters, say, ALLELUIA; for the Lord God Omnipotent *reigneth*.” †††

(10.) “It is not the will of your Father that *one* of these little ones *perish*.” |||—To this it is enough to answer: “Except ye repent, ye shall *all* likewise *perish*.” §§

(11.) “Who gave himself a *ransom* for *all*.” ¶¶—We have a little curiosity to know how a Socinian will argue from these words. But lest it should not be gratified, we prevent his argument by reminding him of those who “*deny*

* Mark xvi. 16. † Vol. II. p. 285. ‡ Eph. ii. 8. || Vol. II. p. 285.

§ Col. i. 28. ¶ Vol. II. p. 285. ** Tit. ii. 11—13. †† Vol. II. p. 285.

‡‡ Rev. xix. 2, 6. ||| Vol. II. p. 285. §§ Luke xiii. 3. ¶¶ Vol. II. p. 285.

the *Lord* that *bought* them, and bring on themselves swift destruction.” *

(12.) “The living God, who is the Saviour of *all men.*” †—Whatever be the meaning of this passage, it relates to the present time, rather than to the future. He *is* the Saviour of all men. Besides, the unbelieving are not *saved*, but *damned*.

(13.) “His tender mercies are over all his works.” ‡—But “he shall have *judgment without mercy*, who hath shewed no mercy.” || Mr. G. is very apt to forget himself. He grants that no mercy will be shewn to the finally impenitent, and contends that they must “pay the last farthing.” He may speak of *goodness* if he please, but *mercy*, as appears from his own concession, is out of the question.—Such, however, are the superficial arguments on which Socinianism is founded.

II. His philosophical objections.

When an Advocate of natural religion, and of the sufficiency of the power of human reason in divine things, undertakes to inquire what are “the fair conclusions of reason, from the perfections of the Deity,” § the Reader will perhaps expect a fine specimen of clear, close, and cogent, metaphysical argumentation. He supposes that Mr. G. has precisely defined, and distinctly proved, those divine perfections which are the basis of his arguments: and that, without any reference to other sources of knowledge, and without any appeal to the passions of his Readers, he argues as coolly and almost as demonstratively as a Mathematician. An examination of Mr. G.’s arguments founded on each of the divine perfections, will at least prove to the Reader that he is to be disappointed.

1. “Let us begin with the *justice* of God.” ¶—But what is the justice of God? Mr. G. has not been pleased to inform us. He leaves us to adopt any idea of it which we think proper, and to change the idea as circumstances require. How then shall we ascertain what is to be expected

* 2 Pet. ii. 1.

† Vol. II. p. 285.

‡ Vol. II. p. 285.

|| James ii. 13.

§ Vol. II. p. 239.

¶ Vol. II. p. 239.

from divine justice, when we do not know what that justice is? Thus all Mr. G.'s argument is a castle in the air.—Divine Justice is that attribute by which God renders to every one that which is *due*. But how does this discover to us in every case *what* is due? Not at all. How then are we to ascertain what is due to a transgressor of the divine law? From that law itself, by which God has at once prohibited the sin, and pointed out its demerit: that is, from divine revelation. “It is a *righteous* thing with God to recompence tribulation to them that trouble you,—when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven—taking *vengeance* on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel: who shall be *punished* with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord.”* Here we rest the question: and whoever professes to believe the scripture, must meet us only on scriptural ground. If a thousand objections be adduced to which we can give no other answer, we have always this reply at hand, “Thus saith the Lord:” and the cause of truth will suffer nothing from our inability to give any other. But we will try.

(1.) Mr. G. urges “the infirmity of human nature, and the temptations to which it is exposed, in extenuation of the crimes of mankind.”†—We do not hesitate to say, that, in *judgment*, God will undoubtedly make *just* allowance for every disadvantage of our condition. But will he not also take into the account the light, the succour, and the encouragement which have been provided, offered, and afforded, and by a proper use of which the disorder of our nature might have been cured, and every temptation might have been overcome? And who can calculate the result, in contradiction to him who has predicted it?

(2.) He urges, that the advocates of eternal punishment “contend that every sin is liable to it.”‡—We contend that “whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one (point,) is guilty of all.”|| But we do not suppose that when “God shall judge the world in righteousness,” the judgment will turn upon this or that particular action, considered singly and exclusively, but upon a review of the whole state

* 2 Thess. i. 6—9. † Vol. II. 211. ‡ Vol. II. p. 211. || James ii. 10.

of probation of each individual. When any man shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, his whole time of probation will be completed, and his character will be perfectly formed. On that character will turn his acquittal or condemnation.

(3.) He urges the shortness of the time spent in sin, which, “compared with eternity, is as a drop of water to the ocean.” *—And will any man in his senses contend that the malignity of sin is to be calculated from the space of time in which it is committed? Whence has that man derived his ideas of justice, who contends that it is unjust to inflict a seven *years'* punishment, on one who has robbed his neighbour in seven *minutes*; or to cut off *for ever* from human society, one who in a *moment* has stabbed his neighbour to the heart? Is any man fit to write on the jurisprudence of heaven, who does not take into his account—the dignity and authority of the Lawgiver,—the reasonableness, justness, and goodness of his laws,—the adaptation of those laws to the prosperity and happiness of the individual subject and of the whole community,—the nature and value of the benefits which the governed derive from the governor and from his government,—the extent of the obligation to be obedient,—the necessity which there is for every government, for its own preservation, to maintain its dignity and to keep up the tone of its authority, (especially when that government is *supreme*, and there is no appeal from its decisions,)—the nature and effect of different crimes,—the degree of injury, dishonour, and displeasure done to the lawgiver, by the transgressions of his subjects,—and both the near and the remote consequences of a breach of social order? We do not pretend to make a calculation of such vast extent; but we venture to assert that no man can, independently of scripture, pronounce a just verdict until he has made it.

(4.) He urges that “some shall be beaten with *many* stripes, and some with *fewer*.” †—Mr. G.’s argument should be founded merely in *reason*.—That punishment will be exactly proportioned to the sins of the criminal, we do not

* Vol. II. p. 242.

† Vol. II. p. 243.

deny. But it is equally possible for a light or a heavier punishment to be eternal. On this supposition, therefore, “the *least* crime will (*not*) be upon an equality with the greatest.” *

(5.) He urges that “the actions of a *finite* being can never merit *infinite* punishment.” †—If by *infinite* be meant *eternal*, this is the thing not to be *asserted*, but to be *proved*.

(6.) He adds: “But a *just* God must have some end in view, in eternally punishing his creatures.” ‡—Undoubtedly. But it is not wisdom to pretend to enter into the *counsels* of the Almighty. “Who hath known the mind of the Lord?” We could follow some of our predecessors in their ingenious conjectures concerning the ends to be answered by the unlimited punishment of the wicked; but “who hath required this at our hands?” It is enough, that though “clouds and darkness are round about him, *righteousness* and *judgment* are the habitation of his throne;” || and that the ends of infinite *justice* will thereby be answered.

(7.) He proceeds: “To suppose that God will everlastingly torture (*punish*) his creatures, merely because his own majesty is offended, makes him a mere God of vengeance.” §—By supposing him to punish his rebellious and incorrigible creatures for ever, we suppose that “to him belongeth *vengeance*.” But we do not “make him a *mere* God of vengeance,” while we suppose him first to have tendered to them his infinite mercy, and “the riches of his grace;” and while we suppose that he may have other reasons for it beside that “his majesty is offended.”

Of Mr. G.’s impassioned comparison (Vol. II. p. 246—248.) we take no notice. He must reason and not declaim: not play the orator but the philosopher.

2. Mr. G.’s attention is engaged next by “the *wisdom* of the Deity.” ¶ His argument on this topic is very brief. You maintain that mankind were “destined to be for ever happy.” “Eternal torture (*punishment*) was not at first intended.” “Is not (then) the original design of God defeated?” **—Mr. G. forms but an awkward guess at what

* Vol. II. p. 244. † Vol. II. p. 244. ‡ Vol. II. p. 244. || Psalm xcvi. 2.

§ Vol. II. p. 244, 245. ¶ Vol. II. p. 242. ** Vol. II. p. 248, 249.

we *maintain*; and therefore we must inform him. We maintain that God made man to be a probationer, intending to "set before him life and death, blessing and cursing," but to enjoin him to "chuse life that he might live,"* and to reward his voluntary obedience with eternal life or to punish his final disobedience with eternal fire. With such purposes, how could God's original design be defeated?

3. Mr. G. makes an awkward transition from the *wisdom*, to "the *goodness, benevolence*, and mercy of God. Of this glorious attribute of the Deity, finite beings (he thinks) can never form an adequate conception." †—No, nor of his *justice*. Why, then, did he presume to argue from premises which he did not comprehend, and *that* even in the face of HIM who does comprehend them? Why did he presume to argue that God *cannot* do that which, as a *just* God, he *declares* that he will; and that he *must* do that, as a *merciful* God, which he has not promised? Or rather, Why does he not relinquish this ineonclusive mode of argumentation, and, on a question which only the scriptures can determine, appeal only to the scriptures?

As Mr. G. cannot comprehend infinite goodness, he argues from *human* goodness. Thus Moses, Paul, and (godly associate !) Mr. White the Universalist, are cited, as men of such benevolence that they could willingly have suffered for their fellow creatures. Is it necessary to remind the Reader that such is the benevolence of God to man, that "he gave his only-begotten Son?" That such is the benevolence of Christ, that he was "made a curse for us?" Whatever of benevolence may be found in Moses, Paul, or Mr. White, the Saviour of men has *done* more for their salvation than any of these men *thought* of doing. The argument drawn from the benevolence of man to man, can therefore conclude nothing further. What these men wished or proposed to do, Jesus Christ has actually done. Again: God is more wise and just than either Moses or Paul. When, therefore, the former said, "Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sin; and, if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of

* Deut. xxx. 19.

† Vol. II. p. 249.

thy book,"—the Lord said unto him, " Whosoever hath sinned against me, *him* will I blot out of my book." And when the latter " could have wished himself accursed for his brethren's sake," it was not permitted.

" What ! shall *benevolence itself* pursue a course of conduct, at which imperfect human goodness would absolutely shudder?"—God will do that at which Mr. G. affects to shudder; and has often done that, " the hearing of which would make a man's ears to tingle."* Yes : and many who really shudder at the thought of it now, will hereafter approve it. When " the smoke" of them that are judged " shall rise up for ever and ever," they will imitate the heavenly hosts, and sing, " Alleluia ; Salvation, and glory, and honour, and power unto the Lord our God: for *true and righteous* are his *judgments*."†

" But God does not look upon mankind as *enemies*."‡—So says Mr. G. And what say the scriptures? " But these mine *enemies*, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me." ||

4. He argues from the Divine *prescience*.—" He that before the beginning of time *foresaw* every thing that would come to pass, would he have created such beings ?—created to destroy ?"—The divine *prescience* is a subject a little too difficult for a human mind to scan : especially as there is nothing in nature by which it can be illustrated. All the arguments founded upon it, are therefore founded on what we do not understand. It is not impossible, however, to give them a rational answer.

(1.) The scriptures declare that " known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world;"§ and yet the same scriptures declare that the wicked " shall go away into everlasting fire."¶ But the scriptures cannot be inconsistent with themselves. (2.) If there be no impropriety in the manner in which God treats mankind as *known*, no man can fix upon it any impropriety as *foreknown*.—(3.) We have already shewn that, in our opinion, the design with which man was created was, that he might be placed in

* 1 Sam. iii. 1. 2 Kings xxi. 12. Jer. xix. 3. † Rev. xix. 1—3.

‡ Vol. II. p. 252. || Luke xix. 27. § Acts xv. 18. ¶ Matt. xxv. 41.

a state of probation. In that case, God created mankind with a positive design, neither that they should be eternally happy, nor that they should be eternally miserable. That man should chuse death rather than life, is not therefore the fault of him that made him, but his own. It is not God's, because he affectionately forewarned him of the danger, earnestly entreated him to be happy, and amply provided for him all the means requisite to his happiness. (4.) If there were any weight in the argument from the Divine *prescience*, it would disprove the possibility of any measure of human misery, as well as of eternal misery.

5. His last philosophical argument is deduced from the divine *immutability*. “All the natural evils which are suffered to befall us (*here*) tend to the production of *good*.”—Mr. G. therefore *presumes* that “unless the nature of the immutable Jehovah should change,—the punishment of a future world will be of a similar nature.” *

Just so, we might *presume* that because good men are afflicted here, they will also be afflicted hereafter. But “*presumptions*” are not arguments. It must be proved that such is the design of future punishment; for the immutability of the Divine Nature will not *change* his purpose or his word. The truth is, it is one of Mr. G.’s first *presumptions*, that to make all his creatures finally happy, is God’s *absolute* design. Setting out on this unfounded theory, he proceeds from one error to another, and fills his book with *presumptions*. That the present is the time of probation, and the future the time of retribution, he cannot see, or will not acknowledge. Hence he supposes earth and hell to be much alike, and the end of suffering in both states to be the same. Even while he describes the present state of human existence, as “chequered with pleasure and pain,” † he cannot advert to the fact, that in *hell* the damned have not “a drop of water to cool their tongue;” nor, while he argues that “*love* is strongest, and in its own nature most powerful to attract and to persuade,” ‡ can he infer that if that infinite goodness which here pierces the clouds of affliction, do not win the hearts of rebels, there is but little probability

* Vol. II. p. 255, 256.

† Vol. II. p. 255.

‡ Vol. II. p. 294.

that all the weight of divine wrath will teach them to love their Maker. He has not as yet proved the salutary nature of "the damnation of hell," and he cannot prove it from the divine immutability, unless he can first prove, that from the beginning it was the *absolute* purpose of God that every man shall be finally happy.

There is one species of Socinian argumentation which Mr. G. has not brought *formally* before us, though his lecture abounds with it. We have one specimen of it where he says, "*Vindictive passions* cannot exist in God."* This remark contains a fundamental principle of Socinianism; and yet it is itself a mere assumption: a dogma by which an important part of Divine Revelation is contradicted. In revealing himself to mankind, God has often used a figure called *anthropopathy*, by which human passions are attributed to the Divine Mind. The ideas conveyed by those allusions, certainly are not the precise and proper ideas of the Divine attributes ; but, rightly understood, and divested of every thing which is weak and sinful in man, they suggest the most appropriate ideas of the ways of God which we can conceive. The ways and the thoughts of God are high above ours, as the heaven is above the earth. But if we do not imitate himself, in imputing to him something like human passions, we exchange revealed knowledge for philosophical ignorance. How often does God speak of his *desire*, *compassion*, *pity*, *mercy*, and *love*? The Socinians seldom dream that these are *human* passions, and that as human passions they "cannot exist in God." Whatever can be fairly, or even speciously, inferred from these passions in men, they presume that they may equally infer from them in God. No pains are then taken, even to shew that all idea of *human weakness* must be removed from them. But when God speaks of his *anger*, *wrath*, *indignation*, *fury*, and *vengeance*, then we are not only taught that these passions are not such in God as they are in man, but are bare-facedly told that they "cannot exist in God," and *that* in such qualified terms as leave us no substitute for those ideas of the ways of God which he himself has suggested.—To

* Vol. II. p. 216.

remedy this, we demand, in the name of scripture and common sense, that the Socinians either desist from reasoning according to their present practice, on the former class of passions, or that they do us the justice to reason in the same manner on the latter, in which they now reason on the former.

One word on Mr. G.'s concluding reflections. "The first is, that the system of universal restitution contains no tenets which present the slightest drawback to the practice of any Christian duty." "The second is, that the doctrine of universal restitution presents the strongest incentive to the practice of any Christian duty, by giving a double efficacy to the motives of gratitude and love."—We think otherwise. Humble fear, and holy love, give life to all genuine piety. He that believes the eternal punishment of the wicked, and embraces the Christian salvation, will have the greatest reason to fear and love. We do not, however, found our doctrine on a mere opinion concerning what is most conducive to virtue and piety, but on the express declarations of the word of God.

CHAPTER XII.

*Of the Divine Inspiration of the Sacred Writings. **

THE divine inspiration of the sacred writings is of the utmost importance to their establishment as the faithful records of religion, and the standard of the principles and practice of piety. This may not be the opinion of those who, with unlimited confidence in the powers of their own reason, profess to demonstrate *a priori*, the existence, the nature, the attributes, and the will of God; but it may be easily and consistently granted by those who believe that “the things of God knoweth no one, but the Spirit of God.” If all knowledge of divine things is from divine revelation, and if there is no divine revelation, but from the Spirit of God, the Bible can be established as a divine revelation of God, his perfections, and his will, only on the supposition that the Writers of it have been divinely inspired: —and to ascertain that they were so inspired, is necessary before their writings can be received with that entire acquiescence of our understanding, and that perfect submission of our will, which a divine revelation demands.

When once a man has got rid of the inspiration of the Old and the New Testament, he feels himself perfectly at liberty to adapt his Bible to his creed, and to reject as false, if not absurd, whatever in the former contradicts the latter. It is thus the Socinians, to keep themselves in countenance under an entire opposition to “the principal doctrines of Christianity,” undermine the divine authority of every Christian document.

* The Author has not been able to insert this chapter and the three following, in what he judges to be their proper place, in consequence of being necessarily governed, partly, by the order which Mr. G. has observed.

However easy it may be to surmount the difficulties of scriptural doctrine, after disposing of the inspiration of scripture, the latter required some management. But Mr. G. knows how to take an advantage. He is not so little versed in the polemic *art*, as not to know by frequent experience, that every doctrine has some votaries who have not formed habits of nice distinction, and who therefore state their opinions in such general terms as to expose them unnecessarily to the attacks of an opponent: nor is he incapable of making choice of such a statement as is most exceptionable. In the present instance, though not in this only, he has given proof of his discretion, by taking the utmost advantage, as will appear from the two inquiries which contain the opinion which he supposes it his business to controvert. (1.) “Whether the *facts* they (the sacred writers) recorded, the *sentiments* they occasionally expressed, the *reasonings* they adduced, the particular *directions* given, *requests* made, and *intentions* specified, all took place under the immediate superintendence, *communication*, *direction*, and controul of the Spirit of God. (2.) Whether their very *words* were *dictated* by inspiration.” *—Such are the opinions which Mr. G. contends, from which he derives all his advantages, and through the sides of which he attempts to wound the inspiration of the scriptures.—We shall not meet him on this ground.

Before we proceed to mark the ground which we propose to defend, a few words may be necessary on the use of the phrase, “the inspiration of the scriptures.” Mr. G. is of opinion that “an excessive and blind attachment to this phrase has been the cause of indefinite mischief in the Christian world:” he therefore recommends that “instead of the terms ‘inspired writings,’ the expressions, ‘heavenly doctrines,’ ‘divine precepts,’ ‘sacred principles,’ &c. of Christianity, be substituted.” †—This is the Opponent of scholastic phrases, the Advocate of scriptural terms!—Asking pardon for our presumption, we prefer the word *inspiration*, as applied to the scriptures, because it is *scriptural*, and is equally determinate with any of those which he has

* Vol. II. p. 320.

† Vol. II. p. 314.

recommended. It is as difficult to define in what degree the doctrines of scripture are *heavenly*, *divine*, or *sacred*, as to define in what way the scriptures were *inspired*.

The truth of the inspiration of the Old and New Testament, does not depend on our stating, with perfect precision, the manner, and the measure, in which the immediate Authors of those books were inspired at the time of writing them. We should not deny that we are the workmanship of God, because we cannot exactly point out the difference, between the creation of Adam out of the dust of the ground, and the production of a man by the ordinary process of generation. Without distinguishing the manner of the divine operations, we know the simple fact, that it is “he that made us and not we ourselves;” and we piously adore him as our Creator. Just so, without knowing distinctly the manner of the divine communication, we may know and acknowledge the divine wisdom and authority with which the Bible teaches and commands us, and with equal piety we may believe and obey. If therefore, we now attempt to trace the footsteps of the Deity, in the revelation of himself, with which he has favoured us, it will not be done under a presumption that we shall point out the precise method, and measure, in which each of the sacred writers received the divine inspiration;—but merely to shew how it was possible for them to have written under a divine influence, without their inspiration being liable to Mr. G.’s objections.

The Bible is a book purporting to be a revelation of God, his works, and his will. It contains every thing suited to the purpose of a divine revelation, every thing that is “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”* It is designed, not only for those among whom it was first published, but for *all* men in *every* age of the world. It is “to make *all* men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God;”† “that in the *ages to come*, he might shew the

* 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

† Eph. iii. 9.

exceeding riches of his grace." * It pronounces a blessing on "him that readeth, and on them that hear the words" which it contains, "and who keep those things which are written therein." †—It was therefore necessary that proper means should be used, to secure its being delivered in such a manner as to answer the vast purpose for which it was given. And since that purpose could be conceived only by the all-comprehending mind of God who knows no distance of time or place, from him only it could originate, and by him it must be directed to its design.

1. It contains a number of important FACTS which form the basis on which the rest of scripture is erected. Of these facts it was necessary that the sacred writers should transmit to us a true and just narrative. The account which Moses gives of the creation, must be such as not only to agree with the real state of things, but to represent God doing his great work in a manner worthy of himself and to manifest his perfections as the Creator. The fall of Adam must be so described, as sufficiently to account for the present state of human nature, and to form a sufficient basis for the whole system of human redemption, with which, without inspiration, Moses must have been very imperfectly acquainted. The behaviour of the Israelites, and the dealings of God with them, must be so delineated as to illustrate properly the divine perfections, and the ways of God with the children of men. The history of Jesus Christ must be a genuine portrait of his character, a true copy of his doctrine, and a foundation for the whole Christian system.

Of some of these facts the narrators were not immediate witnesses. It is not necessary to suppose that they made no use of any written document to which they had access, of any undoubted tradition with which they might be acquainted, or of the credible testimony of immediate witnesses. Moses might learn many parts of his history from the traditions which he collected among the Israelites, and other parts from those of his contemporaries who related what they had seen and heard. Matthew and Luke might take their genealogies, partly from the Old Testament, and

* Eph. ii. 7.

† Rev. i. 3.

partly from other Jewish records. Both of them might receive the account of the birth of Jesus from the holy family. Or the latter might receive the contents of his gospel from those who were “eye witnesses” * of what he recorded.—All this is possible, and even probable: and some part of it is certain. But on the other hand, it was necessary that the Writer should be assured of the truth of what he had thus learned, and of the propriety of making it a part of the Record, and that he should relate the facts in such a manner, as was fit to answer the divine purpose. For this end a divine afflatus was necessary.—But beside this, some of those facts, and some circumstances of others of those facts, could not be known but by divine inspiration. Such are—the manner and order in which the world was created;—that when God saw the wickedness of mankind, “it repented him that he had made man, and grieved him at his heart;” †—and that Jesus Christ “sat on the right hand of God.” The accounts which they give of such facts, and their mingling them with those which might otherwise be ascertained, shew that they were under a divine inspiration at the time of writing.

Of others of the facts which they record, they were themselves immediate witnesses. To doubt whether in publishing those facts, they made use of their best understanding and memory, would be very unreasonable. But here again was to be a *choice* of topics and of circumstances. It was impossible for them to judge accurately what facts, and what incidents it was the mind of God to make known. Nothing was to be wanting which could convey to the Reader the necessary instruction concerning the ways and dispensations of God. Nothing was to be inserted which would be a needless encumbrance to the sacred volume. The manner of relation was to be not only faithful, but judicious, and fit for the illustration of the grand topic, the perfections of that God, who was but partially known to the writer. How was all this to be done without a divine inspiration? If a mere unassisted human understanding was insufficient for this work, an unassisted human memory was still more so.

* Luke i. 2.

† Gen. vi. 6.

The human memory inherits the imperfection of the understanding. When we do not *rightly* apprehend a thing, we cannot *rightly* remember it ; but our misconceptions often render our reproductions monstrous. Prejudice or passion sometimes makes us misconstrue the plainest things. Mr. G. says, that Moses with the highest degree of inspiration was not free from faults. The fault to which he alludes, seems to be of that very kind which would have rendered him a very improper person to write a divine record, without immediate inspiration. “The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Take the rod, and gather thou the assembly together, thou and Aaron thy brother, and *speak* ye unto the rock before their eyes, and it shall give forth his water, and thou shalt bring forth to them water out of the rock : so thou shalt give the congregation and their beasts drink. And Moses took the rod from before the Lord as he commanded him. And Moses and Aaron gathered the congregation together before the rock, and he said unto them, ‘Hear now, ye rebels ; must *we* fetch you water out of this rock ?’ And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he *smote* the rock twice ; and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their beasts also.” * If Moses through prejudice and passion mistook the divine command, and so far misrepresented it as to smite the rock when God had bidden him only *speak* to it ; and to take the glory to himself instead of rendering it to God, and that immediately after he had received that command, how unfit must he have been to represent the mind of God to all succeeding generations without a present divine inspiration !—But this is not the only case in point. The Apostles of our Lord “went in and out with him, beginning at the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up.” They saw his works, and heard his doctrine, and were intended to be witnesses of “what they had heard and seen.” But how little did they understand of what they had heard ! What they did not understand they easily forgot. And if they had remembered something of it, how erroneous must have been their misrepresentations of it under so many mistakes !

* Num. xx. 7—12.

for men generally repeat their own comments rather than the text, and retail their own construction of what they have heard. What possibility was there then, that after the lapse of a number of years, they should remember and record with circumstantial exactness, the many discourses, didactic and prophetic, which are now contained in the four gospels? When they could not conceive the meaning of their divine Teacher, he promised that “the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father would send in his name should teach them all things, and *bring all things to their remembrance*, whatsoever he had said unto them.”* Such were their understanding and memory, that they could not be witnesses of what they had seen and heard, until they “received power, after that the Holy Ghost was come upon them.”† To this, therefore, we are indebted for authentic histories of the life and doctrine of Jesus Christ.

2. They have not only related facts; their writings afford many PREDICTIONS of future events. As no man can naturally have any certain foresight of future contingencies, it is impossible that the sacred writers should utter their predictions without divine inspiration. Prophecy is therefore on all occasions attributed to the Spirit of God. “Would God,” said Moses, “that all the Lord’s people were *prophets*, and that the Lord would put his *Spirit* upon them!”‡ —I will pour out my Spirit, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy. ||—To one is given, by the Spirit, the word of wisdom, to another prophecy.” §—In a word ; “the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but the holy men of God spake [as they were] moved by the Holy Ghost.” ¶ It is not necessary to prove this against Mr. G. who also maintains, “that all the *prophecies* in the scriptures were communicated by the Almighty.” ** But if prophecy came by the Spirit of God, all who uttered *predictions*, by so doing, gave proof that they received the breath of divine inspiration.

3. The DOCTRINES of the Bible come next under our consideration. These were founded on the facts which are

* John xiv. 26. † Acts i. 8. ‡ Num. xi. 29. || Joel ii. 28.
§ 1 Cor. xii. 8, 10. ¶ 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. ** Vol. II. p. 319.

recorded by the sacred writers, or on the prophecies which they delivered. They consist of those speculative and saving truths which it was a principal object of the Book of Revelation to make known to mankind, the things of God which no man knoweth but the Spirit of God, and therefore were communicated by inspiration. As our Lord promised that the Spirit of truth should teach his Apostles, and remind them of all things whatsoever he had said unto them,—he promised also, that the same Spirit should make known to them whatever was further necessary for the fulfilment of their ministry. “I have yet many things to say unto you, (he observed) but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, (that) shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.”*—Mr. G. need not be afraid that we shall seek any undue advantage from the expression, “*all things*.” We include only “all” those “things” which Jesus had yet to say unto them, but which they could not yet bear.

The Apostle Paul had not heard the instructions, or seen the miracles, of Jesus Christ, and therefore received the whole system of Christian doctrine by immediate inspiration. Hence he says to the Galatians, “I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.”† This revelation to St. Paul, included both the *words* and the *deeds* of Jesus Christ. He therefore mentions to the Corinthians, his having “*received* that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day: that he was seen of Cephas, of the twelve, and of above five hundred brethren at once,” &c. ‡ Again: “I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.

* John xv. 13, 14.

† Gal. i. 11, 12.

‡ 1 Cor. xv. 3—8.

After the same manner he took also the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood ; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.”* Hence we learn that this Apostle had both the *words* and the *deeds* of Jesus Christ revealed to him.

Mr. G. has conceded “ that all the peculiar doctrines of Christianity were of heavenly origin ; that they were not the deductions of reason in the minds of their first promulgators, but were imparted to them by God.”† Thus far then is clear, that the Apostles originally received the doctrines of the gospel by divine inspiration. It is now our business to enquire in what manner those doctrines were delivered. We know that the Prophets and Apostles often delivered their doctrines *viva voce*, in their public discourses. But of those public discourses we know nothing, except from the *written* documents which they have bequeathed to the world. The question therefore is, Do the original documents contain those very doctrines which the Prophets and Apostles received immediately from God ? If they do not, then have we no doctrines of which we are assured that they are of heavenly origin. The *scriptures*, then, are *none* of them divinely inspired. But if the original scriptures do contain the precise doctrines which were “imparted by God to the first promulgators of them,” and those doctrines are “all the peculiar doctrines of Christianity,” then those scriptures which contain the peculiar doctrines of Christianity are divinely inspired.

4. The sacred writers have promulgated not only doctrines of which they speak as being of divine origin, but *precepts* and *prohibitions*, which they attribute to the same authority.—We cannot deny that these were received from above, without denying the *authenticity*, as well as the *inspiration*, of scripture. Moses, as the Jewish mediatorial legislator, received his precepts immediately from God. The tables of stone, containing the ten commandments written by the finger of God, were delivered to him on the mount. With him God spake “month to month.”‡ The Apostles received their precepts, principally from Jesus

* 1 Cor. xi. 23—25.

† Vol. II, p. 321.

‡ Num. xii. 8.

Christ, to whom the Spirit was given not by measure, and therefore promulgated them as the commandments of the Lord. The moral or ecclesiastical regulations which they had not received from him during his ministry, were made known to them by a *vision*, as in the case of Peter, to whom it was thus revealed that the gospel should be preached to the uncircumcised ; (Acts x.) or were revealed to them by the Holy Ghost, as when the Apostolic council decreed, that the Jewish yoke should not be imposed on the Gentile converts ; (Acts xv. 28.) and when the whole gospel, *preceptive*, as well as doctrinal, was made known to St. Paul. (Gal. i. 12.)—Thus all their precepts originated from the Spirit of God.

If we suppose that in recording these divine doctrines and commands, the writers were directed and assisted by divine inspiration, it is not necessary to suppose that the exercise of their natural powers was suspended. It is enough if their minds were enlightened, their judgments cleared, and their memory assisted, so as to secure a faithful record of what had been delivered to them for the benefit of mankind. All we have to ascertain therefore, is, that the Holy Spirit is the voucher for the divine truth of the doctrines, and the divine authority of the commands.

5. There are several things which now make an essential part of the divine revelation, but which probably did not constitute a formal part of the first revelation given to the Apostles. Their inspiration with respect to these, also demands our serious consideration.

(1.) The Apostles frequently *quote* from the Old Testament. It was not necessary that in making these quotations, they should have the words *suggested* to them ; but it was necessary that they should be taught to make a proper application of them, that they might not corrupt, instead of contending for, the faith delivered to the saints, and to guard them against the false glosses of those who had perverted them.

(2.) They in many places *argue* against those who deviated from the truth of the gospel. If we suppose the truth of the gospel to have been communicated to them from

above, it is not necessary to suppose that all their arguments were communicated in the same manner. But as every man is in danger of drawing wrong conclusions from the truth itself, it was necessary that in delivering the system of Christianity to the world, they should be guided to reason justly from the divine principles which they had received. If we admit that they were left merely to exercise the powers of their unassisted reason, we are immediately left without any thing which we can ascertain to be a divine revelation; because we cannot distinguish between their own reasonings, and those truths which were made known to them without the deductions of their own mind.

(3.) They sometimes made prudential *regulations* in the Christian church. For instance: The Apostle Paul recommended celibacy to the Corinthians. He acknowledges that he had "no commandment from the Lord" on this head. Jesus Christ had not *commanded* celibacy, though he had *recommended* it under given circumstances. It was not perhaps necessary that it should be immediately *suggested* to the Apostle to recommend this measure to the unmarried, as "good for the present distress;" but it was necessary that he should be under such a divine influence as would lead him to give his judgment in a manner worthy of the Christian cause. And it is remarkable, that he did deliver it, "as one who had obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful," and concluded it with what stamped his advice with divine wisdom, by observing, "I think also that I have the Spirit of God."*

6. There are several things in the Apostolic epistles which are not essential parts of the revelation of God, and some which have no necessary connection with religion. There are "facts recorded, sentiments expressed, directions given, requests made, and intentions specified," which it is not necessary to suppose "took place under the communication of the Spirit of God." † Yet it is not unreasonable, as the record of these is connected with the divine revelation, to suppose that they were, for special purposes, *recorded* under the "*superintendance and control* of that Spirit."

* 1 Cor. vii. 25—40.

† Vol. II. p. 320.

St. Paul might *intend* to “take a journey into Spain,” * and to pass by way of Corinth into Macedonia, † to propagate the gospel in those parts ; and yet he might be frustrated. The *intention* was not the fruit of divine direction ; but the *record* of that intention might proceed from the Spirit of God, to shew that a minister ought to live and die, forming and prosecuting plans for the spread of Messiah’s kingdom. It may be recorded that St. Paul recommended to Timothy to “take a little wine for his stomach’s sake,” to shew that God requires good men to take care of their health :—that he requested him “to bring his cloke and books,” to shew that a good man may be poor, and ought to take care of what little property he has ; and that a great man may properly make use of the ordinary means of knowledge and of learning :—that he informed him that “he had left Trophimus sick,” to remind us that afflictions befall the best of men : that he “desired Philemon to prepare him a lodging,” to shew that the greatest concerns ought not to make us negligent of those which are of less moment, and that proper conveniences ought, if possible, to be provided for the itinerant servants of Christ :—and that “Alexander the coppersmith had behaved ill to him,” to warn mankind of the danger of treating with unkindness the ministers of the gospel. Now if these incidental circumstances afford such useful lessons, without “supposing the sentiment and style of them to be *dictated* by the Spirit of God,” we may justly believe them to be written under his “*superintendance* and *controul* ;” for if they are not essential parts of the divine revelation, they are at least useful appendages to it, and therefore not unworthy of his notice.

Hitherto we have attended only to the *matter* of divine revelation ; we shall now pay some attention to the *language* in which it has been delivered.—But this part of the subject is by no means of the same importance with the preceding. If it be supposed that the sacred writers have delivered the truths of God in appropriate and unexceptionable terms, it will perhaps make no great difference, whether or not we

* Rom. xv. 24, 28.

† 1 Cor. xvi. 5.

believe the words to be immediately and distinctly suggested by the Holy Ghost.

1. Some of the revelations which the sacred writers received, were delivered to them in *words*. Such were those which Moses received, “God spake all these words, saying,” &c. * Such were many of those communicated to the Prophets. Such were all those which the Apostles received from Jesus Christ, during his stay on earth. And such was a very considerable part of what St. John has related in the Apocalypse. All these, and such as these, are therefore properly couched in the *words* of God.

2. Many of their revelations appear to have been communicated by *suggestion* to their minds. When the ideas suggested to them were *sensible* ideas, those ideas by a natural association would undoubtedly lead to the words which in common language are made the signs of them; and no other words were necessary. On the other hand, some of those ideas were *abstract* ideas. Now abstract ideas can be entertained by the human mind only as connected with words. To prove this, let any man make the experiment, whether he can form in his mind one single abstract proposition without words. If he cannot, he must allow that the inspired writers were led to conceive all such revelations in *words*. Those words may with propriety be said to be the words of God, as being connected with the ideas which the Divine Spirit suggested; and yet the arrangement of them might take the mould of the mind which conceived them. Thus the sacred writers might on these occasions “speak the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth,” and yet each one might speak in his own characteristic style.

3. If the inspired writers were thus taught to express themselves on divine subjects, in a proper manner, by the immediate revelations which they received, their general style on the same subjects would be formed on this model. Whenever they spoke or wrote on a topic purely religious, though they might not use terms immediately *suggested* at the time, they spoke, as St. Paul expressly asserts, “in

* Exod. xx. 1.

words which the Holy Ghost *teacheth*:" for from him they had learned them.

4. On subjects not religious, it was best that they should express themselves in common language.

After this explanation, the distinct and only question which remains to be discussed is, Did the sacred penmen *write* their several books under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost? With a hope that our meaning will not now be mistaken, we decidedly take the affirmative side of the question.

To shorten the dispute, and to clear the argument, as much as may be, of all encumbrances, let it here be noted, that what we seek is not proof merely that the writers were inspired, for that will not answer our specific purpose: but that they were inspired as *writers*. And if it should appear from the scriptures themselves that divine inspiration is ascribed to their *writings*, it will sufficiently appear that they were inspired in *writing*.

1. We will first enquire into the inspiration of the *writings* of the *Old Testament*.

(1.) Our Lord speaks of the *writings* of the Old Testament as inspired.—“ David himself said by the *Holy Ghost*, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.” *—This is a citation from the xevth Psalm.—Now the Psalms are not *orations* which were first delivered *viva voce*, but *written* compositions. It follows that they were *written* by inspiration.

(2.) The Apostle Peter, speaking of Judas, says, “ This *scripture* must needs have been fulfilled which the *Holy Ghost* by the mouth of David spake before;—for it is *written* in the book of Psalms,” &c. † Here the Apostle plainly attributes the Psalms of David to the *Holy Ghost*, when he is speaking of them as *scriptures*, (that is *writings*) and of what is *written* in them.

(3.) The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, citing the xevth Psalm, makes no mention of the amanuensis, but introduces his citation with the words, “ As the *Holy Ghost* saith,” ‡—and citing the xxxist of Jeremiah, he begins, “ The *Holy Ghost* also is a witness to us; for after that he had said before,” &c. ||

* Mark xii. 36. † Acts i. 16, 20. ‡ Heb. viii. 7. || Heb. x. 15.

(4.) The Apostle Peter says, “No prophecy of the *scripture* is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the *Holy Ghost*.”*—

Here again he is speaking of the prophecies of *scripture*, or of *written* prophecy.

(5.) Lastly, St. Paul has given us the same view of the subject in those remarkable words: “From a child thou hast known the *holy scriptures*, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All *scripture* (is) given by inspiration of God, and (is) profitable for doctrine, &c.”†

On this passage observe: [1.] The Apostle is speaking of *scriptures* (writings). [2.] That he calls them the *holy scriptures*, namely those books which the Jews received as canonical, and were called by them “the *holy writings*.” [3.] That he speaks of them as being “*all given by inspiration of God*.”

Mr. G. says, “If you refer to the passage, you will find the auxiliary verb, *is*, printed in *Italics*, and consequently not in the original Greek. It may, therefore, with equal propriety be translated thus: ‘All scripture is given by inspiration of God, is profitable,’ &c.”‡—On this we remark: [1.] That if we admit Mr. G.’s translation, still it proves that the *holy scriptures* are divinely inspired; for the Apostle having mentioned the *holy scriptures* as able to make a man wise unto salvation, assigns as a reason for this, that “all scripture given by inspiration from God, is profitable,” &c. “Holy scripture is profitable for doctrine,” and able to make a man wise unto salvation, because it is “given by *inspiration of God*.” [2.] But Mr. G. ought to have remarked that the second (*is*,) also is supplementary; and that, although the Apostle’s words are sense in Greek, there is, without it, no sense in the translation. If he had then observed the situation of the conjunction, (*and*,) as every English reader may do, he would then have seen that the auxiliary verb must be supplied where our translators have inserted the *first* of the two. “All scripture

* 2 Pet. i. 20, 21.

+ 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

‡ Vol. II. p. 331.

is given by inspiration of God, and (is) profitable," &c.

How much then must our Lord and his Apostles have been mistaken, if the holy writings of the Old Testament were not divinely inspired !

2. We now come to the inquiry whether the *writings* of the *New* Testament were also inspired.

It is of some importance to observe here, that our Lord, before his ascension, was pleased to promise to his Apostles the special gift of the Holy Ghost.—“The Comforter, (said he) which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.”*—Again: “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; and he will shew you things to come. He shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.”†

This great gift was promised to them, to fit them for their apostolic ministry.—“When the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall *bear witness*, because ye have been with me from the beginning.‡—When he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.”||—Again: “Ye shall receive *power*, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be *witnesses* unto me.”§—It is an important question: Did not the Apostles bear witness of him as well by their *writings*, as by their *preaching*?

The Holy Ghost was promised to them, not as a temporary, but a permanent gift. “I will pray the Father, (said our Lord,) and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you *for ever*:” ¶ that is, says Mr. G., “during your lives.”**

This gift they actually received. “When the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in

* John xiv. 26.

† John xvi. 13—15.

‡ John xv. 26, 27.

|| John xvi. 8.

§ Acts i. 8.

¶ John xiv. 16.

** Vol. II. p. 218.

one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them ; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."*

That the Holy Ghost was thus given to prepare them for *preaching*† the gospel, so that "they spake *as the Spirit gave them utterance*," is an important truth. But they were equally inspired by it in *writing* for the establishment of Christianity, and for the edification of the churches.

(1.) Hence they assert their Apostleship at the head of their Epistles. "Paul an *apostle of Jesus Christ, according to the faith of God's elect*, and the *acknowledging* of the *truth which is after godliness*." (See Tit. i. 1. Rom. i. 1. 1 Cor. i. 1. 2 Cor. i. 1. Gal. i. 1. Eph. i. 1. Col. i. 1. 1 Tim. i. 1. 2 Tim. i. 1. Tit. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 1. 2 Pet. i. 1.) In this manner they assert their *apostolic authority* in their *writings*.

(2.) They assert that the substance of their writings was the very doctrine which they preached, and which they had learned from above. For instance : "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you *the gospel which I preached unto you*, which also you have received, and wherein ye stand : by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I *preached* unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. †—For this cause, I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward : how that by *revelation* he made known unto me the mystery ; as I *wrote* afore in few words, *whereby* when ye *read* ye may *understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ* ; which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now *revealed* unto his holy apostles and prophets *by the Spirit*.||—That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we

* Acts ii. 1—4.

† That they *spake* by the Holy Ghost, is obvious from the following passages, as well as from many others. 1 Cor. ii. 6—16. 2 Cor. xiii. 3. 1 John iv. 6. &c.

‡ 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2.

|| Eph. iii. 1, 5.

have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life ; for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and *bear witness*, and *shew unto you* that eternal Life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us ; that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us ; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these things *write* we unto you, that your joy may be full. *—Brethren, I *write* no new commandment unto you, but an *old* commandment, which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the *word* which ye have *heard* from the beginning.” †

(3.) They speak of their inspiration with respect to their *writings*. Thus St. Paul giving his judgment to widows, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, adds “I think also, that I have the Spirit of God.” ‡ The word δοκεω, (rendered “I think,”) does not imply any doubt, but a satisfactory degree of certainty.—The same Apostle, speaking of the grand apostacy, in his *epistle* to Timothy, prefaces his prediction with, “Now the *Spirit* speaketh expressly.” || In another place to the Thessalonians, he observes, “For this we say unto you *by the word of the Lord*,” &c. §—St. John says, “I was *in the Spirit* on the Lord’s day, and heard behind me a great voice as of a Trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last : What thou seest, *write* in a book.—*Write* the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter,” ¶ Hence the frequent repetition of those words, “He that hath an ear let him hear what *the Spirit* saith unto the churches.” **—Peter says, that his “beloved brother Paul, had *written according to the wisdom given unto him* ;” and classes his *epistles* with “the other scriptures.” ††—And lastly, St. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians on the common duties of Christian morality, inculcates them by adding, “He that despiseth, despiseth not man, but Ged, who hath also given unto us his *Holy Spirit*.” ‡‡

* 1 John i. 1—4.

† 1 John ii. 7.

‡ 1 Cor. vii. 40.

|| 1 Tim. iv. 1.

§ 1 Thess. iv. 15.

¶ Rev. i. 10, 11, 19.

** Rev. ii. 11, &c.

†† 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

‡‡ 1 Thess. iv. 8.

(4.) Hence they exercise an *apostolic authority* in their *epistles*. [1.] With respect to points of *doctrine*.—"Behold, I Paul say unto you, That if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law."* [2.] With respect to points of *morality*.—"But to the rest speak I, not the Lord, [who has *said nothing* on this subject,] if any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away.—And so *ordain I* in all churches."† [3.] With respect to *ecclesiastical regulations*.—"I have *written* unto you, not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, &c; with such an one no not to eat.—Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person."‡—Now we *command* you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly. ||—Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, *anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord*."§—[4.] With respect to the use of *spiritual gifts*. See 1 Cor. xiv.—Would St. Paul pretend to regulate those who were *inspired*, even the *prophets* themselves, unless *he were inspired* in so doing?—[5.] And lastly: With respect to the behaviour of all the subordinate officers of the church: instances of which abound in the epistles to Timothy, and in that to Titus.

(5.) And hence they assert the *apostolic authority* of their *writings*. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I *write* unto you are the commandments of the Lord. ¶—Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or by our *epistle*."**—And if any man *obey* not our word by this *epistle*, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed. ††—These things [which I have *written*] command and teach."††—The reader may see also, Col. iv. 16.

* Gal. v. 2, 3.

† 1 Cor. vii. 12, 17.

‡ 1 Cor. v. 11, 13.

|| 2 Thess. iii. 6.

§ James v. 11.

¶ 1 Cor. xv. 37.

** 2 Thess. ii. 15.

†† 2 Thess. iii. 11.

‡‡ 1 Tim. iv. 11.

1 Thess. v. 27. 1 Tim, v. 21. vi. 13, 14. 1 Pet. v. 12.
 2 Pet. i. 15. iii. 1, 2. Jude 3. and Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

From all this it appears that the Holy Spirit, which was promised to the Apostles to guide them into all truth, and to make them competent *witnesses* of Christ, was with them in their *writing* as well as in their public ministry, and supported that *apostolic authority* with which they publish to the end of the world the truths which they preached.—The arguments which Mr. G. has urged on the contrary part, are not levelled *directly* against the preceding observations, and, therefore, it is necessary to examine them only so far as they are *apparently* relevant.

1 “ In order to establish the truth of the Christian religion, was any thing else necessary, than that we should have complete evidence of the *facts*, and of the *divine origin* of the doctrines ? ” *

It was necessary, after the facts had taken place, that the doctrine founded on them should be deduced from them, that the consistency of that doctrine with the preceding dispensations should be explained, and that the doctrine itself should be vindicated against ordinary cavils. This could be done only by the aid of that Spirit whose office it was to bring things to the “ *remembrance*” of the witnesses, to “ teach” them the truth, and to prepare them to be the immediate “ *witnesses*” of Jesus Christ.

2. “ But the highest degree of inspiration did not confer *infallibility*. ” †

It is necessary to distinguish between the infallibility of the sacred writers in their personal conduct, and that in their delivery of the divine revelation : and between their fallibility in religious opinions, and their being permitted to propagate their errors. In their moral conduct, Moses and Paul were free agents ; in their prophetic character, they were the organs of the Divine Spirit. As moral agents they were capable of doing wrong : as men inspired, they recorded their own faults, for a warning to other men. Again : Peter might be fallible, and refuse to go to Cornelius ; but yet his error was not permitted to

* Vol. II. p. 323.

† Vol. II. p. 322, 348.

overrule the divine purposes. He is taught, by a divine revelation, what his prejudice had not permitted him previously to learn. He might prove his fallibility by separating himself from the Gentiles for fear of the Jews; but the apostle Paul, writing for the edification of the church, mentions it only as a *fault*. His error is not permitted to propagate; for while it is recorded it is condemned.

3. “On some *specific occasions* a claim is laid to a superintending divine inspiration. What can be more self-evident than that by thus asserting, that they *occasionally* spoke by divine inspiration, they did not make it as a *general claim?*” *

How weak must be that cause which can be supported only by such an argument as this! When a person, on some more important occasions, asserts the authority by which he speaks, can we infer that he does *not* speak by the same authority at all times, because he is not perpetually ringing it in our ears? There is, however, in Mr. G.’s argument, another important flaw. The cases which he has adduced on this occasion, are not cases of mere “superintending divine inspiration.” St. Paul had received the whole gospel, including the *commandments* delivered by Jesus Christ, the design of his death and resurrection, and the nature of the Lord’s supper, by revelation: not by a mere “superintending divine inspiration,” but either by *suggestion* or *verbal declaration*. If therefore, in speaking on these subjects, he asserts the authority by which he speaks, he cannot be understood as abandoning, on other occasions, his “claim to a *superintending* divine inspiration.”

4. But “in repeated, distinct passages, they absolutely *disclaim* a divine inspiration in their writings.”

(1.) “They declare that they have not *dominion* over the faith of their followers, but are helpers of their joy.” †—When the scriptures are thus quoted for a specific purpose, the occasion gives them a certain colouring, and we are very apt to suppose, at the first view, that they are well applied. It often happens, however, that if he that quotes them would attempt to draw out his argument at length, he would

* Vol. II. p. 341.

† Vol. II. p. 341.

himself perceive its fallacy. This is precisely the case in the instance before us. Mr. G. has quoted this passage to prove that the Apostles were not inspired with the knowledge of those doctrines which their disciples were called upon to believe: and in the very same page, he has cited the words of the same Apostle to the same Church, in which that Apostle asserts that he himself had "*delivered*" to them that which he had "*received*" by *divine revelation*, which they had "*believed*," and "*by which they were saved.*"* Perhaps the judicious Reader will be of opinion that the Apostle meant to say, he had no *lordly* "*dominion over their faith*" to subvert it. This sense agrees with the context in which St. Paul subjoins by way of argument, "*for by faith ye stand.*" Thus understood, it is precisely what he has said to the Galatians: "*Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.*"† The Apostles could "*do nothing against the truth, but for the truth:*" they had "*no authority for the destruction of the church, but for its edification.*"

(2.) "They address themselves to the reason of their disciples, and appeal to their understanding whether they were right." †--And why not? Why may not he who speaks with divine authority appeal to the judgment of his hearers? Did not our Lord himself make similar appeals? "Yea, and why even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right?" || And how does this prove that he did not speak by divine inspiration?

(3.) "St. Paul says, on some occasions, 'I speak this by permission, not of commandment;—' to the rest speak I, not the Lord;—'I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment.'" §—Very true: and thus he makes a distinction between those things which "were not the deductions of reason, but were imparted to him by Jesus Christ," and those things which *were* the deductions of his *inspired* reason. Hence while on such occasions he acknowledges that Jesus Christ had himself given no *commandment*

* 1 Cor. xv. 1-3. † Gal. i. 8. ‡ Vol. II, p. 342. || Luke xii. 57.
 § Vol. II, p. 342.

on these points, (which is the true meaning of those expressions,) he claims the superintendency of the Spirit in his advices. First, he declares that he gave his judgment as one that had “obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful;” * by which preface he asserts his apostolic authority. Secondly, he says, “I speak this by permission:” † of which permission he could know nothing but by *inspiration*. Thirdly, he concludes, “I think also that I have the Spirit of God:” ‡ and thus claims, at least, a *superintendent* inspiration.

(4.) But Luke makes “a positive assertion that he writes his gospel, of his own *individual* authority, *without any command, or supernatural influence.*” ||—Indeed he does not! Nor does he “disclaim” a supernatural influence. This is one of the grand mistakes: that a man can do nothing under “a supernatural influence,” for which his own mind has conceived a *reason*. But why cannot God lead men *by* their reason, as well as *without* it? Until this question be answered, “this of itself” is not “sufficient to settle the point in agitation.”—So far is Luke from conceding the fact of his inspiration, that some Critics think he has positively asserted it. “It seemed good to me, (he says) having had perfect understanding of all things *ωντες, from above*, to write unto thee.” § This is the sense in which *ωντες* is used in John iii. 3, 7, 31. xix. 11. James i. 17. iii. 15, 17.

5. “The *reasonings* with which the books composing the New Tesaament abound, evidently shew that they were not written under the influence of plenary inspiration.” ¶

Not at all. Doesnot Godhimself *reason* with mankind, and say, “Come and let us *reason* together?” ** Did not Moses *reason*, when he says, “Do ye thusrequite the Lord? O foolish people and unwise! is not he thy father that hath bought thee? Hath he not made thee?” ††—And yet Mr. G. grants that he had “the highest degree of inspiration.” ‡‡—Did not Jesus Christ *reason*, and *reason from a preceding divine revelation*, when he said, “Have ye not read that which was spoken unto

* 1 Cor. vii. 25.

† 1 Cor. vii. 6.

‡ 1 Cor. vii. 40.

|| Vol. II. p. 342.

§ Luke i. 3.

¶ Vol. II. p. 343.

** Isa. i. 18.

†† Deut. xxxii. 6.

‡‡ oV.III. p. 319.

you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.”* And was not he inspired?—Did not St. Paul “*reason* of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come,” before Felix?† And did not our Lord say, “When they deliver you up, it is not ye that speak, but the *Spirit* of your Father which speaketh in you!”‡—Where then is the inconsistency between *reasoning* and *divine inspiration*?

This is a point of great importance. The Socinians uniformly assume, that there can be no divine inspiration, but where divine truths are imparted *without* the deductions of reason in the mind of the recipient. Nothing can be more foreign from truth. Our Lord promised the inspiration of the Spirit to his Apostles, when they should “be brought before governors, and kings for his sake;” and this inspiration was such that he thought proper to say, it should not be they that spoke, but the *Spirit* of their Father. And yet, there is no occasion on which the Apostles *reason* on the revelations which they had previously received, more than in their apologies. (See all the apologies of Peter and Paul in the book of Acts.) So true it is, that the Apostles were inspired when they *reasoned* on the truths which had been previously *suggested* to them.

6. “They often speak with such *uncertainty* as to render it incredible, that the sentiment was at the time dictated by the *Spirit of God*.||

(1.) We do not argue that every sentiment which the Apostles wrote, for any purpose whatever, was *dictated* by the *Spirit of God*, any more than that God *dictated* to David that, “There is no God.”

(2.) Much less do we suppose that every thing was dictated *concerning which* they wrote. Mr. G. has instanced in such passages as the following: “I know not whether I baptized any other.” “I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will.” Now what is it that the Apostle directly affirms in such cases, but that he was *uncertain*? He knew that *he did not know*. And what he wrote, he wrote with truth. Who supposes that the Apostles knew *every*

* Matt. xxii. 31, 32. † Acts xxiv. 25. ‡ Matt. xvii. 20. || Vol. II. p. 345.

thing by inspiration? Who contends, that *when* they were *confessedly inspired*, they were *at that time omniscient*? It was enough that they knew that which it was necessary for them to write. Their *ignorance* was their own, and not God's; but it does not hinder that they were under a divine influence. It cannot be necessary for a man to tell a lie, in proof that he is inspired. The Apostles were inspired by the Holy Ghost: but “they had this treasure in earthen vessels.”

7. “The writers of the New Testament often make *quotations* from the Old Testament in a very *incorrect* manner. Is it not a grievous reflection upon the moral character of the Deity to represent him as dictating a quotation from a prophet to different writers, and yet inspiring them to give that quotation inaccurately and variously?” *

(1.) It is not necessary to inspiration that *words* should be *dictated*.

(2.) It is not necessary, even if God should *dictate* the words of a *quotation*, that the words should be, without any variation, the precise words of the original Author. It is the *sense* that is to be quoted: and if the *sense* be *fairly* quoted, the *words* may be more or less varied, according to the particular purpose for which the *sense* is quoted.

(3.) In addition to this, some allowance is to be made for a *translation*. If it were necessary, that *quotations* from the *original* should be always *verbally* the same; it is not equally necessary, that one person should always *translate* the same words, in the same *manner*. Now the fact is, that the passages in question are not properly *quotations* but *translations*. And why should such a barrenness of language be attributed to the Spirit of God as would render it necessary always to use the same words on similar occasions? Had all the Apostles translated the same passage in the same manner, it would have been deemed a stiff, unnecessary monotony, unworthy of the Spirit by which they wrote.

(4.) Many of the mistakes which Mr. G. has enumerated (Vol. II. p. 252.) are not necessarily imputed to the origi-

* Vol. II. p. 351.

nal Writers, but to subsequent Copyists. Some of them have been rectified from different manuscripts; and all of them, as he grants, are “unimportant.” *

8. “In the last place, in the writings of the evangelists, there are *inconsistencies* and occasional *contradictions*, which in my estimation render it utterly impossible, that they should have written under the influence of a divine inspiration.” †

(1.) The first case of *inconsistency* and *contradiction* is the account which the Evangelists give of the speech of Jairus to our Lord, concerning his daughter.

Matthew makes Jairus say, “My daughter *αρτι ετελευτησεν*, is now at her end.” The Evangelist could not mean by this expression to say that she was positively *dead*; because he subjoins, “Come and lay thy hand upon her, and (not, she shall be *raised again* but) *ζητεται*, she shall (not die but) *live*. ”‡ Luke makes Jairus say, “*Αποθνησεν*, she lay dying;” i. e. when the father left her. Here then is neither *inconsistency* nor *contradiction*, unless it be forced upon them.—Again: Luke says, “*τις* a certain person came and told him she was dead.” Mark says, “*some* came and told him she was dead.” Now here is neither *inconsistency* nor *contradiction*, unless Luke had said, ‘*only one*’ came. But it is not only possible, but perfectly natural, to suppose, that *one* came before the rest, and that Luke satisfies himself with mentioning the *first*, and Mark mentions them *all*.

(2.) The second case of *inconsistency* and *contradiction*, is that of blind Bartimeus.

Matthew states, that as Jesus departed from Jericho, he healed two blind men. || Luke states that this miracle took place, *εν τω εγγιζειν*, which Dr. Doddridge renders, “while he was *yet near* to Jericho.” For this the Doctor assigns several reasons, especially the LXX. on Isa. l. 8. and Jer. xxiii. 23. where they use the same phrase. If this be just, here is neither *inconsistency* nor *contradiction*.

But “Mark and Luke (Mr. G. says) state, there to have been *only one* blind man, whilst Matthew says *two*.” § The

* Vol. II. p. 353. † Vol. II. p. 358. ‡ Matt. ix. 18. || Matt. xx. 29.

§ Vol. II. p. 360.

Reader will perhaps turn to the Evangelists; but he will not find that either Mark or Luke says, there was “*only one*.” They mention *one*, but this is not *inconsistent* with there being more than one, or any direct *contradiction* of what Matthew says. Bartimeus might be best known, and his case most striking, and therefore, two of the Evangelists, passing over the other, might mention him only.

(3.) The third instance of *inconsistency* and *contradiction* is in the case of the two thieves, who were crucified with our Lord.—Here again to support his argument, Mr. G. makes Luke say “positively, that *only one* of them reviled him.”* With what degree of *truth*, the Reader will easily know. The fact appears to be, that at first both the thieves reviled him. One of them afterwards repented, while the other continued his contumely. The penitent thief then rebuked his wicked companion. Now Matthew relates particularly the obloquy which was cast upon the Saviour by all around him, and therefore mentions their *both* reviling him. Luke is relating the *conversion* of *one* of the thieves, and the immediate fruit of it, (which Matthew omits,) and therefore dwells upon that part of the awful scene which was subsequent to the conversion of the penitent. The one omits what the other relates; but *inconsistency* or *contradiction* has no existence between them.

(4.) The last case of *inconsistency* and *contradiction* relates to the *inscription* which was fixed over the head of Jesus Christ, at his crucifixion. It would be tiresome to the Reader to go over a string of remarks similar to those already made. The truth is, the Evangelists *differ* from each other; but without any *inconsistency* or *contradiction*: and there is no difference between the Evangelists which is more easily accounted for. The inscription was written in *three* languages; and undoubtedly according to the *genius* of each of them. Suppose that, in Hebrew, it was written, “The King of the Jews.” This agrees with the account which Mark has given. If this Hebrew inscription, as the *first* of the three, was translated by Luke, according to the *genius* of the Greek, he would render it, “*This is the King*

* Vol. II. p. 360.
T 2

of the Jews." Suppose then Matthew to have given the proper Greek inscription, and John the Latin translated into Greek, all their different statements are accounted for. But Mr. G. to serve his purpose, takes into his head, first that the three inscriptions agreed *verbally* with each other; and secondly, that each Evangelist "professes to give the actually inscription :" and having proved a variation from each other, he shrewdly denominates it, *inconsistency* and *contradiction*.

In concluding this subject, one thing must again be repeated. Mr. G. takes for granted that there is *no* inspiration but that of *immediate suggestion*: and against this he points all his artillery. But in *facts* of which the sacred Writers were witnesses, immediate *suggestion* was not necessary, even to the exactness of the history. The Evangelists related what they *saw* and *heard*: and it was enough that the Spirit of truth should bring things to their *remembrance* and give them to understand them, that the promise of Jesus being fulfilled in them, they, according to his design, might *bear witness concerning him*.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the Fallen State of Mankind.

THE present inquiry relates to the condition of human nature independent of Jesus Christ, and of the blessings of that gracious covenant of which he is the Mediator. According to the doctrine of scripture, many blessings are bestowed on mankind, which are not hereditary, but which are the gift of redeeming grace: and many good effects are thereby produced, which are not natural, but supernatural, and which are to be attributed to him by whom we are created *anew* in Christ Jesus unto good works. As the present design is to delineate the true state of mankind, in order to ascertain their want of a Saviour, and of every branch of the Christian salvation,—“the gift of God by Jesus Christ” must be either left entirely out of the question, or introduced as collateral evidence, on the principle on which we prove the sickness of a patient from the character of his physician.

The subject divides itself into two parts, of which the first relates to that moral depravity which is transmitted to us from our first parents: the second relates to our being legally involved in the consequences of their sin.

First. Of that moral depravity which is transmitted to us from our first parents.

It is generally granted by those who are not determined to controvert the most obvious facts, that, with the exception of those who are *renewed* in the spirit of their mind, mankind have been, and still are, desperately wicked. This melancholy fact even the heathens have seen, acknowledged, and lamented. Their iron age is a striking picture of the consummate wickedness of mankind. Socrates confessed that

he was prone to the grossest vices. Seneca laments that “ all vices are in all men.” Propertius, that “ every body has a vice to which he is inclined by nature.” And Horace, that “ mankind rush into wickedness, and always desire what is forbidden;”—that “ we are foolish enough to attack heaven itself;”—and that “ our repeated crimes do not suffer the God of heaven to lay by his wrathful thunderbolts.”

The universal wickedness of mankind, is, however, a truth, for the confirmation of which we cannot entirely depend on their own opinion or testimony. Their confessions may easily be attributed to a voluntary or mistaken humility: and their evidence against each other to malice and envy. Even the knowledge of ourselves may possibly be an improper standard of the human character: and our experience may be too limited to become the foundation of a sentence on a whole species. But we can place unlimited confidence in the testimony of the Most High: to whose decision we the rather appeal, because “ that which is highly esteemed among men is, (often) in his sight, an abomination.” Men are apt to “ judge according to outward appearances;” whereas God “ trieth the hearts,” and “ judgeth righteous judgment.” Mankind are frequently tempted by self-love to flatter each other, and to extenuate each other’s crimes; but “ the judgments of God are true and righteous altogether.” There is no counsel against the Lord, nor any appeal from his decision. “ Let God be true, and every man a liar; as it is written, That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and overcome when thou art judged.”

According to the unerring testimony of divine truth, the first man born of woman, was “ *of the wicked one*, and slew his brother, because his own works were evil, and his brother’s righteous.”* Religion was set up in the family of Seth, who “ began to call upon the name of the Lord.”† But “ when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and daughters were born unto them, the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. And the Lord said,

* 1 John iii. 12.

+ Gen. iv. 26.

My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is *flesh*: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were *giants* in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men, which [rather than *good* men] were, of old, men of renown. And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man, whom I have created—for it repenteth me that I have made them.” “The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and behold, it was corrupt: for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, The end of all flesh is come before me: for the earth is filled with violence through them: and behold, I will destroy them with the earth.” *

After God had purged the earth by a flood, and had entered anew into covenant with Noah and his family, the truths of religion were soon erased from the minds of mankind, and its institutions were soon neglected. To renew its obliterated traces and to prepare the world for the coming of the seed of the woman, Abram, a “Syrian ready to perish,” was called from the house of idolatry to become a witness of Jehovah. And what was the character of his progeny? Alas! their unbelief, obduracy, disobedience, murmurings, rebellions, and idolatries, are known from their whole history. It was not without reason that God bore witness against them by his prophet: “Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for the Lord hath spoken: I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his Master’s crib: but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider. Ah sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil-doers, children that are corrupters! they have forsaken the Lord, they have provoked the Holy One of Israel

* Gen. vi. 1—13.

unto anger, they are gone away backward. Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more. The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds and bruises, and putrifying sores."—It is true they were very *religious*; but their religion was only the garb of hypocrisy, and the cloak of wickedness.—"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the **Lord**: I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands to tread my courts?—Your hands are full of blood."*

Nor did the calamities of a long captivity produce among them any lasting reformation. They were still "a disobedient and gainsaying people." Purged from gross idolatries, their religion was still formal, and their heart worldly.—When the harbinger of the Messiah announced the coming of their Deliverer, so long as they were left satisfied with themselves, and were permitted to indulge in their worldly expectations, they rejoiced in his testimony. But when the doctrine of the Son of God unmasked their hypocrisy, and the humility of his appearance cut off their secular prospects, they soon neglected him, forsook him, derided him, contradicted him, blasphemed him, laid snares for him, meditated his destruction, conspired against him, seized him, arraigned him, accused him, condemned him, and procured his crucifixion: and still proceeded to "fill up the measure of their iniquity, till wrath came upon them to the uttermost."

In the mean time, what was the moral state of the rest of mankind? The "Gentiles were walking in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that was in them, because of the blindness of their hearts, who being past feeling, had given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness."†—When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were

* Isa. i. 2—15.

† Eph. iv. 17—19.

thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.— Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness *through the lusts of their own hearts*, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen ! For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections ; for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature : [*Pasiphaen nivei solatur amore juvenci :*] and likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman ; men with men working that which is unseemly, [*Formosum pastor Corydon ardebat Alexin :*] and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.—Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness ; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity ; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents ; without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful : who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.” *

Such was the state of the Gentiles. “ What then ? Are we better than they ? No, in no wise, (says St. Paul,) for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin.” This the Apostle proves by summing up the suffrages of his inspired brethren, in which are asserted, (1.) The *universality* of human wickedness :— “ There is none righteous, *no, not one* : there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable ; there is none that doeth good, *no, not one*.” (2.) The *eruptions* of this wickedness in every possible way. “ Their *throat* is an open sepulchre ; with their *tongues* they

* Rom. i. 21—32.

have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their *lips*; whose *mouth* is full of cursing and bitterness: their *feet* are swift to shed blood, destruction and misery are in their ways; the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes.” *

Thus “have the scriptures *concluded all under sin*,” for “*all* have sinned and come short of the glory of God,” insomuch that, “if we say we have not sinned, we make God a liar, and his word is not in us.” This is the melancholy fact. But how is this fact to be accounted for? According to the scriptural account of the origin of man, he was at first created in the image of God. How is it then that mankind resemble evil demons, more than the Holy God?

To set aside the scriptural method of solving this problem, the universal and glaring wickedness of mankind has been attributed to every cause that could be invented.

1. It is said, that “sin is the *abuse of free agency*: and that every man is a sinner merely by his own unbiassed choice.”

That all actual sin is the abuse of free-agency, may be true. But the abuse of free-agency, though it may appear sufficiently to account for any *one* sin, or for the sinfulness of *one half* of mankind, can never account for *universal* wickedness. Again: “If men were never drawn into sin any other way than as Adam was, namely, by temptations offered from without, the case would be somewhat different. But there are numberless instances of men sinning, though no temptation is offered from without. It is necessary, therefore, some other account should be given of *their* sinning than of Adam’s.” †—In fact, this is only giving back the same question in another form: “What is the reason that *all men* have abused their free-agency?”

2. It is said, that “mankind have contracted evil *habits*, which render wickedness natural to them.”

That evil habits have added very much to some other cause, and have increased the difficulty of our cure, is

* Rom. iii, 9—16.

† Wesley on Orig. Sin, p.188.

readily granted. It is not easy for those “to do good, that are *accustomed* to do evil.”* But evil *habits* are the *effect*, as well as the *cause*, of evil *practices*. The evil practices which induce evil habits, are therefore still to be accounted for.

3. It is said, that “the prevalence of *bad example* is the true cause of universal sinfulness.”

To this it is answered: (1.) That the first sinner can have had no bad example before him. Cain, for instance, had no example of *persecution* and *murder*, by which he was led astray. Wickedness therefore existed before bad example. (2.) There must have been a general *prevalence* of bad conduct before bad examples could prevail. (3.) There have been *good* examples set before mankind, as well as *bad* ones. If example, therefore, be the only thing which governs the conduct of mankind, especially as it is so much more reasonable to copy a good, than a bad example, the good and bad must have divided the world pretty equally between them.—We have still to enquire, therefore, what is the source of bad examples, and what is the reason that mankind so readily follow them.

4. It is said, that “a defective education is the cause of universal wickedness.

Education is undoubtedly Θεραπεία Ψυχῆς, “the medicine of a diseased soul.” “Ye shall know the *truth*,” said our Lord, “and the *truth* shall *make you free*.”† The want of it may therefore be one important cause of the *continuance* of the malady: but it cannot be the original cause of its existence. The want of medicine may leave men the unresisting prey of disease; but we are not wont to attribute the *existence* of a disease to the want of medicine. Where there is no disease, there is no need of medicine; for “they that are whole have no need of a physician.” The cause of the spiritual sickness of mankind is, therefore, yet to be sought.—And beside this: Why have mankind neglected the education of their offspring? And why do the souls of men resist the healing influence of education?—Still we are at a loss!

* Jer. xiii. 23.

† John viii. 32.

5. "But if *one* of these do not account for the universal wickedness of mankind, may not the concurrence of them all produce this phenomenon? Suppose the first sin to have been occasioned by a mere abuse of free-agency. This first sin may have corrupted the heart of the individual, and so opened a flood-gate of iniquity. From this source many sins have sprung forth. Sinful practices have grown into sinful habits; and sinful habits have been fruitful of further sinful practices. The sinful habits and practices of the individual, have prevented the religious education of his offspring, and have been the cause of bad example, which, not being counteracted by proper instruction, has been productive of universal sinfulness."

This is putting the case in its strongest light. But let us examine it. (1.) This hypothesis embraces all the consequences which will follow from the common one, and therefore makes but little difference in the result. (2.) It deserves all the praise of human invention; for it cannot be proved from revelation. The inventor of it was, therefore, undoubtedly a man of genius. (3.) There is, however, a lameness in it which does not belong to *truth*. It accounts tolerably well for the defection of an individual; but not at all for that of all his offspring. It supposes his offspring to be naturally *upright*, and yet supposes them to *fall* without an *adequate* cause. It supposes them to want medicine (education) before they are diseased, and to be so disordered as *universally* to follow a bad example, while yet it supposes them to be in perfect health.

This subject may possibly be better understood when viewed in the light of an apt illustration. Suppose then, that God made man with a taste for wholesome food, and a dislike to poison. Now the phenomenon to be accounted for is, that all the human race have preferred deadly poison, to wholesome food. To solve this problem, you say that "the first man perversely ate of the poison, and thereby vitiated his taste. From thenceforth he ate poison only, and rejected food. His offspring, though born, as their parent was created, with an appetite for food, and an antipathy to poison, witnessing continually the example of their father, and not

being properly informed how the poison may be expelled by antidotes, or how a vitiated taste may be rectified,* copied the bad example which they witnessed, vitiated their taste, and, from that time, severally rejected their proper nourishment and ate only poison.”—You think you have perfectly accounted for the phenomenon. But review the whole affair, and you will perceive that you have left the grand difficulty as you found it; viz. How a *whole race* of beings were led to act contrary to the law of their nature, to overcome the bias of an unvitiated taste, to resist their appetite for food, and their antipathy to poison? How is it that *not one* of them has preserved his taste unvitiated, and overcome the influence of a bad example to which their very constitution was repugnant?

The scriptural method is the only one in which we can account for this melancholy fact, the universal wickedness of mankind.

1. According to the sacred writers, the external wickedness of human conduct flows from an internal *depravity of heart*. They inform us, that “the heart is *deceitful* above all things and *desperately wicked*: † that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is *only evil continually*: ‡ that the heart of the sons of men is *full of evil*, and *madness* is in their heart while they live: || that out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: § that as a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit,—an evil man, out of the evil treasure of his *heart*, bringeth forth that which is evil: that of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh: ¶ and that it is an evil heart of *unbelief*” which causes them to “depart from the living God.” **

Thus far, Mr. G. goes with us hand in hand. At least, till he vindicate himself against the charge, we may venture to accuse him of consistency. “The word *devil*,” he says, “seems in general accusation to signify nothing more than

* In allusion to that kind of instruction of which mankind stand in need, and which God has given us by revelation, which is “*the gospel of our salvation*.”

† Jer. xvii. 9.

‡ Matt. xv. 19.

|| Gen. vi. 5.

§ Luke vi. 43, 45.

¶ Eccles. ix. 3.

** Heb. iii. 12.

that *propensity to ill, observable in the human mind.*"* Mr. G. will undoubtedly abide by this observation, that there is "in the human mind" a "propensity to ill."

2. This depravity of heart, however it may be increased by our voluntary indulgence of it, is traced back to our *infancy*.—"The imagination of man's heart is evil from his *youth*."[†] "The word we render *youth*, includes childhood and infancy, the earliest age of man; the whole time from his birth." "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a *child*."[‡] "The wicked are estranged *from the womb*, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies."^{||}

3. It is therefore imputed to our *birth*, as an *hereditary disorder*.—"Man that is *born of a woman* is of a few days and full of trouble.—Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one. §—What is man that he should be clean? and (he that is) *born of a woman*, that he should be righteous? ¶—Man is *born like a wild ass's colt*."^{**}—"How keenly is the comparison pointed! Like the *ass*, an animal stupid even to a proverb: like the *ass's colt*, which must be still more egregiously stupid than its dam: like the *wild ass's colt*, which is not only blockish, but stubborn and refractory; neither has valuable qualities by nature, nor will easily receive them by discipline. The image in the original is yet more strongly touched. The particle *like* is not in the Hebrew. *Born a wild ass's colt*: or as we should say in English, *a mere wild ass's colt*."^{††}—"Behold, I was shapen in iniquity: and in sin did my mother conceive me."^{‡‡}

Hence our Lord, insisting on the necessity of a new birth, says, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."^{|||}—The plain meaning of which words is, that every one *born of a woman*, needs to be *born again*, and to be born of the *Spirit*, before he can enter the kingdom of heaven; and that his being born of the *flesh*, is what renders it necessary that he should be born of the *Spirit*. It is commonly objected to

* Vol. p. 76. † Gen. viii. 21. ‡ Prov. xxii. 15. || Psalm lviii. 3.

§ Job xiv. 1, 4. ¶ Job xv. 14. ** Job xi. 12. †† Ther. and Asp. Dial. 13.
‡‡ Psalm li. 5. ||| John iii. 6.

this interpretation, that by “flesh” our Lord means “infirm humanity.” He himself, however, was a partaker of the *infirmitie*s of *human nature*. In that sense he was born of the *flesh*, and was *flesh*. But did he need to be born again of the *Spirit*? If the passage be compared with other parts of scripture, it will be found to mean, that which is born of *sinful* human nature, is *sinful* human nature, and needs to be born of the *Holy Spirit*, that it may be *holy*. “If to walk after the *flesh*, as opposed to walking after the *Spirit*, is to follow our sinful inclinations: if to be in the *flesh*, opposed to being in the *Spirit*, is to be in a state of sin: if the *flesh* and the *Spirit* are two contrary principles, which counteract each other: if the works of the *flesh*, and the lusts of the *flesh*, are opposed to the *Spirit*, and the fruit of the *Spirit*: then to be born of the *flesh* (in opposition to being born of the *Spirit*) must signify something more than being born of a woman,”* and to be *flesh* (or carnal) in opposition to be *Spirit* (or spiritual) must mean something more than to partake of infirm humanity.

The doctrine of hereditary depravity is thus established, by our being taught to trace it to our birth and conception. In this way we are directed to a long, unbroken chain, the last link of which is *one's self*; and the first of which is Adam. Of him we are informed, as if to instruct us particularly in this subject, that “Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son, in his own likeness, after his image.”† “The *image* of Adam in which he begat a son after his fall, stands opposed to the *image* of God in which man was at first created. Moses had said, verse 1, ‘In the day that God created man, in the *likeness* of God made he him.’ But speaking of Adam, as he was long after the fall, he does not say, ‘He begat a son *in the likeness of God*;’ but ‘he begat a son *in his own likeness, after his image*.’ Now this must refer to Adam, either as *a man*; or as a *good man*; or as a *mortal, sinful man*. But it could not refer to him merely as a *man*. The inspired writer could not design to inform us, that Adam begat a man, not a lion or a horse. It could not well refer to him as *a good*

* Wesley on Orig. Sin, p. 371.

† Gen. v. 3.

man. For it is not said, ‘Adam begat a son, who at length became pious like himself;’ but ‘he *begat a son in his own likeness.*’ It refers to him therefore as a *mortal, sinful man*; giving us to know, that the mortality and corruption, contracted by the fall, descended from Adam to his son: Adam, a sinner, begat a sinner like himself. And if Seth was thus a sinner *by nature*, so is every other descendant of Adam.”* —This subject will require further elucidation.

“God created man in his own image.”†—He made him in his *natural* image: in the image of his intellectual and self-determined nature. As an intelligent being he made him capable not only of *sensitive*, but of *abstract* knowledge. He formed him capable of knowing not only *visible* but *invisible* things: of knowing not only the properties of matter, but also of mind: of being led from effects to their causes, and of being taught to perceive their relations to each other, and the consequences of those relations. He made him capable of being directed from the knowledge of *himself*, a *visible effect*, a *creature*,—to his *invisible cause*, his *Creator*; and from the *sensible* blessings which he enjoyed, to the bountiful *Donor*. He made him capable of being taught his derivation from God, and his dependance on him: of learning and entering into the wise design of his Creator, so as to comprehend the purpose of his own existence. He gave him a capacity to understand the will of his Maker, and to perceive his obligation to do it. His understanding was therefore capable of exercising that sort of judgment which we call *conscience*: it could be taught to dictate what was *right*, and to accuse or to excuse him. As God is “a God of knowledge by whom actions are weighed,” he made man like himself, capable of *weighing* his own actions.—As God made man after the image of his own infinite understanding, he made him capable of self-determination. The Most High “doeth according to his will.”‡ So man was made, not a machine, but a being whose actions are his own, and spring from his *choice*.—Such was the natural image of God in man. But this *natural* image was only the basis of his *moral* image. And this moral image was *knowledge* and

* Wesley on Orig. Sin, p. 95. † Gen. i. 27. ‡ Dan. ix. 35.

holiness. (1.) It was KNOWLEDGE. God endowed him with an adequate measure of that knowledge of which he made him naturally capable. As God had made him capable of corporeal sight, and gave him light to make all things visible, that he might see; so God who made him capable of knowledge, of spiritual and divine knowledge, was himself a light unto him: and as the sun renders himself visible, by his own light, and sheds his light on the visible creation, so in God's light did man see light. (2.) He made him in the image of his HOLINESS.—This knowledge gave the *bias* to his will. His choice was therefore wise, and right, and good. His heart was fixed on God as his portion. He loved God supremely, and with an undivided heart. He chose the will of God as the rule of his actions: and the glory and pleasure of God, as the end of them. Thus, as God is “most upright,” he “made man *upright.*” He created him according to God, and planted in him the principles which led him to imitate God in righteousness and true holiness.

Over such a being, it was reasonable and proper that God should assume the character, not only of a gracious Benefactor, but of a righteous Governor. When man knew his Maker's pleasure, could discern between good and evil, was free to chuse the one or the other, he was capable of moral rectitude or obliquity, and was therefore a proper subject of moral government. Able as he was to appreciate the blessings which he enjoyed, and to perceive the hand which bestowed them, it was fit that the continuance of those blessings should only accompany his voluntary dependence on the Donor, and his grateful acknowledgment of the gifts. Whatever favours might, in the beginning, be bestowed on him gratuitously, must not be continued to him capriciously, but on the principle of a benign and holy justice, and, in some sort, according to his fitness to receive them, and his fidelity in the use of them.

The test to which it pleased God to put the obedience of Adam, was such as suited his constitution. The prohibition of the fruit of a certain tree, which was, in appearance, “good for food, and pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be

desired,"—was a trial whether man would live according to the *Spirit*, or after the *flesh*:—whether he would continue to make choice of God, as his portion, or turn from him to a creature. The act whereby our parents fell, was therefore a rejection of the knowledge and enjoyment of God, a defection from their dependence on him and their allegiance to him, and a consignment of themselves to the government of the flesh. The consequence was, that the appetites of the body became disordered and irregular: their disordered appetites inflamed their mental passions, and their passions enslaved their reason. As God was rejected, his inspiration was withdrawn; and as the Devil was victorious, he took possession of the territories which he had subdued.

That this was the moral state to which Adam was reduced by his fall; and that the state of mankind, till they are restored by Jesus Christ, is precisely the same, will clearly appear from a candid examination of the scriptures.

1. Before his transgression, Adam had *knowledge*, and had it from his creation. He was "created in knowledge." When he had sinned against God, and had thereby rejected and departed from the source of spiritual and divine light, his mind was darkened, and ignorance took the place of his preceding knowledge. Of the gross ignorance of God into which he was now fallen, we have a most palpable proof, in his attempt to "hide himself" from the divine omnipresence and omniscience "amongst the trees of the garden." *—Is then the natural state of all mankind, similar to that of Adam *before*, or *after*, his fall? This question is easily answered from those parts of scripture which declare, "there is none that understandeth—God; † that the world by wisdom knew not God; ‡ that the Gentiles knew not God; ¶ that they have their understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the *ignorance* that is in them because of the *blindness* of their hearts; § and that to be RENEWED in knowledge after the image of him that created them," it is necessary that they should "put off the *old man*

* Gen. iii. 8.

† Rom. iii. 11.

‡ I Cor. i. 21.

¶ 1 Thess. iv. 5.

§ Eph. iv. 18.

with his deeds, and put on the *new*, where Christ is all in all.”*

2. Before his fall Adam had no *irregular* or *inordinate appetite*. For instance: With the exception only of the forbidden fruit, God gave him leave to enjoy *without restraint* the creatures which he had given to him. “Of every tree of the garden, said the Lord God, thou mayest freely eat.”† But from the time of their fall, the fruits of paradise were refused to their now irregular appetite, which was to be checked by the use of more homely food, and the tax of labour and sweat. ‡—Does the present state of mankind more resemble the state of innocent, or of fallen, Adam? Is it now safe for human beings to be given up to unrestrained appetite, even in things lawful? No: “The flesh now lusteth against the Spirit. ||—If, therefore, we live after the flesh, we shall die.” It is now become necessary to “*mortify* the deeds of the body that we may live? §—They that are in the flesh cannot now please God. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh: but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace: because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.”¶—The “fleshly lusts now war against the soul.”** That any man may be spiritual, he must be born again of the Spirit. “That which is born of the flesh is flesh; but that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.”†† Before a child of Adam can be renewed in the spirit of his mind, he has to “put off the old man which is corrupt, according to the *deceitful lusts*; and to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”‡‡

The power which the now irregular appetites of human nature have to overbear our enfeebled and darkened reason, is never more conspicuous than in the awakened sinner who, like Medea, says, *Video meliora proboque; deteriora sequor.*

* Col. iii. 9, 10.

† Gen. ii. 16.

‡ Similar observations might be made on their other appetites.

|| Gal. v. 17.

§ Rom. viii. 13.

¶ John iii. 6.

|| Rom. viii. 5—4.

** 1 Pet. ii. 11.

†† Eph. iv. 22—24.

Such is the awakened Jew described by the Apostle Paul, whose language is, “We know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.—Now then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know, that in me (that is in my *flesh*) dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another *law in my members*, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members.” *

Mr. G. has given us a very luminous view of this subject. “Let us for one moment reflect, what man is. He is a being composed of body and mind. His mind consists of intellect and will.. The former comprehends reason and judgment, the latter containing passions and affections of various kinds.—The body is perpetually exciting those passions of the mind which are *inconsistent* with reason, and contrary to judgment, and therefore denominated *sinful*.†—“This “bondage of corruption,” is broken only by the power of Jesus Christ. “There is, therefore, no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, makes us free from the law of sin and death.”‡ They, therefore, and only “they that are Christ’s, have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts.||—Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” §

3. When Adam had thus preferred a creature to his Creator, and embraced the gratification of an animal passion in preference to the enjoyment of God, he lost the blessing of communion with God: and by the loss of that commu-

* Rom. vii. 14–23.

† Vol. II. p. 241.

‡ Rom. viii. 1, 2.

|| Gal. v. 24.

§ Rom. viii. 9.

nion with God which, from the moment that God inspired him with the breath of life, was the life of his soul, he became, according to the warning given to him, *spiritually dead*. Here again we ask, Is the present state of mankind, without Christ, the same in which Adam was *made*, or that into which he *fell*? Are mankind naturally in a state of communion with God, and spiritually alive from their birth? or are they without God, and alienated from the life of God? The answer is at hand. We have already found that “there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after, —God;” that “there is no fear of God before their eyes:”* to which we may add, with St. Paul, that all mankind, while they are “Gentiles *in the flesh*,” who are “without Christ,”—are “*ἄστοι*, without God in the world:”† that “having the understanding darkened,” they are “*alienated from the life of God*, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart:”‡ that “if one died for all, then were *all dead*:”|| and that to every man now spiritually alive, it may be said “as to those that are alive *from the dead*,”§ “And you who *were dead* in trespasses and sins, wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, [like all other men,] according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience, among whom also *we all* had our conversation in time past, in the *lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh*, and [the consequent desires] of the mind: even when *we were dead in sins*, God, who is rich in mercy, hath *quickened us together with Christ*, and hath raised us up together, and made us to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.”¶

4. By the conquest of Adam, Satan obtained a power over him which before he did not possess, according to that maxim :—“of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought into bondage.”** Before the sin of man, Satan had no access to his mind or imagination, but through his senses. Hence arose the necessity for the Deceiver’s making the Serpent the instrument of his design. We read

* Rom. iii. 11, 12. † Eph. ii. 11, 12. ‡ Eph. iv. 12. || 2 Cor. v. 14.

§ Rom. vi. 13. ¶ Eph. ii. 1—6. ** 2 Pet. ii. 19.

of no such mean of temptation being subsequently used till the temptation of our Lord, who on one occasion says, “The Prince of this world cometh, *and hath nothing in me.*”* His only way of tempting Jesus Christ was, as in the case of Eve, through his senses. But not so with mankind, since their first parent was “overcome and brought into bondage.” From that time, he is “the Prince of this world.” “The world now lieth in τῷ πνεύματι, the wicked one.”† As “the prince of the power of the air,” this “spirit now worketh in the children of disobedience, among whom we all had our conversation in time past.”‡ “He that committeth sin, [and ‘all have sinned,’] is of the Devil; for the Devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil.”|| And his gospel is sent, “to turn men from darkness to light, and from the *power* of Satan unto God.”§

Thus while the scriptures lead us up to our first parents from whom we derive our hereditary depravity, they point out the precise similarity between their state after their fall, and the present state of their progeny; and that in every particular, and in such a manner as to furnish us with additional proof, that the moral disorder of human nature is to be attributed to their fatal disaster. We have traced the corruption of the stream up to the fountain, and have found the corruption of the fountain and of the stream, to be precisely the same.

Secondly: Of our being legally involved in the penal consequences of the sin of our first parents.

It is not intended here to assert that the posterity of Adam are accounted personally guilty of his personal sin. This is impossible. It is not, however, impossible for a parent, as the representative of his progeny, to involve them in the ruinous consequences of what must always be deemed his own fault.

When Adam was placed in the garden of Eden, “the LORD God commanded him, saying, Of every tree of the

* John xiv. 36.

† 1 John v. 19.

‡ Eph. ii. 2, 3.

|| 1 John iii. 2.

§ Acts xxvi. 18.

garden thou mayest freely eat, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, dying, thou shalt die.”*—The threatening by which God thus enforced this command, included not only the death of the body, but that of the soul: a death every way opposed to the *lives* which were given to him, when “the Lord God breathed into his nostrils the breath of *lives*, and man became a living *soul*.†—To this penalty Adam stood exposed when he ate of the forbidden fruit. Had the sentence been immediately executed in its full extent, the personal existence of all his posterity would have been absolutely prevented. The conclusion, therefore, that by his crime the personal existence of his progeny was forfeited, is unavoidable. Had condign punishment been inflicted on *him*, *they* must have perished in his loins: and thus, though *they* would not have suffered the personal punishment of his personal crime, their seminal sin would have met with a seminal punishment. As “Levi paid tithes in Abraham, being yet in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him,”—so the children of Adam sinned, “being yet in the loins of their father,” and in his loins they would have been destroyed.

When God arraigned Adam before his bar, though he convicted him of sin, he did not pronounce on him this sentence, but granted him a gracious reprieve. The first judicial sentence which God pronounced, was upon the Tempter. “And the Lord God said unto the Serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field: upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.”‡—This sentence was, for Adam, a gracious sentence. It was not, however, a sentence of acquittal, but a reprieve. It did not absolve him, as the sequel shews; though it did hold out to him the prospect of beholding the multiplication of his species. It did not place him on the high ground from which he had

* Gen. ii. 16, 17.

+ Gen. ii. 7.

‡ Gen. iii. 14, 15.

fallen, but promised him a Deliverer by whom he might be restored.

Under this reprieve Adam lived to behold his progeny. But as he was not thereby absolved, so neither was his posterity, considered as *his posterity*. Hereby, neither were they restored to the possession and enjoyment of the blessings forfeited by him; nor was the penal sanction of the broken covenant annulled. Considered merely in their relation to Adam, all mankind were, therefore, brought into condemnation, and were subject to the penalty of death. Whatever they became by *grace*, they were, “*by nature, the children of wrath, even as others.*”*—The sense of this passage may be disputed, but it cannot be overturned. (1.) “The phrase *children of wrath*, is a Hebraism, and denotes persons worthy of, or liable to, wrath.” (2.) The word *φυσει*, *by nature*, cannot mean custom or habit, for it never has that sense when it stands alone, without any qualifying epithet. (3.) It means *by birth*. This is the sense in which the writers of the New Testament use it, “*We who are φυσει Ἰudeoi, Jews by nature: that is, Jews by birth.*”† (4.) This affirmation the Apostle makes of himself, the Ephesians, and others.—Hence those plain and repeated declarations of St. Paul:—“*By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.* (For until the law, sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.)—Through the offence of one, many are dead:—for the judgment was by one to condemnation.—By one man’s offence, death reigned by one.—By the offence of one, or, rather, *δι’ ενος παρατωματος, by one offence,* (judgment came) upon all men to condemnation. By one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.”‡

In this important passage, Adam is spoken of as *τυπος*, a *type*, or figure of him that should come, viz. of Jesus Christ. In what sense he is a type, is obvious from the

* Eph. ii. 3.

† Gal. ii. 15.

‡ Rom. v. 12, 19.

whole passage, in which the writer runs a parallel between the type and the antitype, and shews that like Jesus Christ he is a representative of all mankind. Hence Jesus Christ is termed “the last Adam.”*—This “first man Adam” is the “one man” here repeatedly mentioned. By him, (not by the *Devil*, not by *Eve*; for *they* were not common representatives,) sin, and death “the wages of sin,” entered. By his *one* sin (for only till the commission of that was he a representative,) all were constituted sinners,—judgment came upon all men to condemnation,—and death reigned over all. This the Apostle proves by an appeal to an incontrovertible fact,—the death of “those [infants] who have not [personally] sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgressions,” and who, therefore, have not personally incurred the penalty of sin.—Thus the doctrine on which we insist is positively asserted in its full extent by apostolical authority, and proved by an unanswerable argument. Dr. Priestley himself acknowledges, that “if this passage be interpreted literally, it will imply that all are involved in his (Adam’s) *guilt*, as well as in his sufferings.”†

To this interpretation it is objected that “by *all men being constituted sinners*,” and by the “*judgment which came on all men to condemnation*,” nothing is meant but “their being liable to the death of the body.”

Let the passage be considered in its own light, and it will appear that the Apostle speaks of another death than that of the body; viz. *eternal death*.

1. The death which is the consequence of sin, is the subject of the Apostle’s observations. This needs no other proof than what arises from a perusal of ver. 12, 17, 21.

2. The death which came by sin must be eternal death, because the Apostle contrasts it with eternal life: “As sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign unto *eternal life*, by Jesus Christ.”‡ So, in another place:—“The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is *eternal life*, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”|| As no *medium* can be found between life and death, the death incurred by sin could not make eternal life necessary, unless that death were

* 1 Cor. xv. 45. † Hist. of Cor. Vol. I. p. 266. ‡ Rom. v. 21. || Rom. vi. 23.

otherwise eternal. If mankind are not exposed to eternal death, they have already eternal life, and God needed not to give it by Jesus Christ; for this would be to give only what they already possess. In other words: If eternal life is the gift of God by Jesus Christ, then eternal life was forfeited: which is the same as to say, that "the penalty of eternal death was incurred."

3. According to the Apostle, corporeal "death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over [infants] them that had not [personally] sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."* How then could he say, that "as by the offence of one (judgment came) upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (the free gift came) upon all men to justification of life?"† For if the only sentence of condemnation is that of bodily death, how does justification of life come upon those who suffer by that sentence, and thereby suffer the whole penalty to which they are exposed?

4. If it be said, "But infants who have suffered the penal sentence of corporeal death, are subsequently raised to life by Jesus Christ, and in that sense justification of life may be said to come on them also:"—we answer, (1.) It is an odd sentence of justification which is pronounced after the *supposed penalty* has been borne. Is not this at once to *remit* and to *inflict* the penalty? Is it not like forgiving a debt after the debtor has paid it? (2.) After suffering this sentence of the death of the body, either they would, without Christ, have eternal life, or they would not. If they would, then eternal life is not the gift of God through Jesus Christ. If they would not, then the gift of eternal life by Jesus Christ saves them from eternal death, which otherwise would have been the consequencee. (3.) The objector may take that side which he thinks most nearly allied to truth.—Let him be a materialist. He then supposes that the death of the body, is the death of the whole man. According to this hypothesis, immortal life depends entirely on the resurrection of the body. He, therefore, who raises the body, saves the man from eternal death, by giving him

* Rom. vi. 11.

† Rom. v. 12.

eternal life : and he that is dead, unless his body be raised, is ETERNALLY dead.—On the other hand : Let the Objector entertain a contrary opinion. Let him suppose that man has a spirit which is naturally immortal. *Eternal life* must then be distinguished from *eternal existence* ; because it is supposed to be a *gift* to a being to whom an *eternal existence* is *natural*. It must stand opposed, not to *annihilation*, but to “*eternal punishment*.” This is obviously the sense in which the scriptures use the term. “These shall go away into everlasting punishment : but the righteous into life eternal.” * Eternal life, in the scriptural sense of the term, is eternal blessedness. “Come, ye blessed of my Father,” &c. † If Jesus Christ justifies all the infant offspring of Adam, and gives them eternal blessedness, he saves them from its opposite, eternal misery : an eternal misery which is the inevitable consequence of the eternal existence and banishment from God, of a spirit made to be blessed, and necessarily desirous of happiness. But if by justifying them, and giving them eternal life, he saves them from eternal misery,—it is obvious that eternal misery would have been their portion, unless they had thus been justified and saved.

Having shewn that the whole human race were involved with their parent in the immediate legal consequence of his fall, we now explore the new condition in which our first parents and their posterity were subsequently placed.

1. “And the **LORD** God said unto the woman, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception ; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children ; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.” ‡—Here we see, that because the woman had unlawfully gratified her desire without consulting her husband, who, if he had been consulted, might probably have been the mean of saving her from sinning, her desire was subjected to his rule ; and sorrow was entailed upon her as a consequence of the gratification of her desire. But as the former is a grant, that she and her husband should still live together; her sorrow was connected with the production of her seed, the predicted

* Matt. xxv. 46

† Matt. xxv. 31.

‡ Gen.iii. 6.

Deliverer.—It will not be denied, that the present state of married, and child-bearing, women, agrees precisely with the tenor of this sentence pronounced on Eve.

2. “ And unto Adam, he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it ; cursed is the ground for thy sake : in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee ; and thou shalt eat of the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground : for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” †—In this sentence, a curse is pronounced on the ground ; but not *immediately* on the man. Adam is indeed warned of his mortality, already induced by his sin, and his death is predicted ; but in a manner which clearly indicates that he should be mercifully spared, and that, at the expence of labour, the ground, though under a curse, should afford him sustenance. This labour is entailed particularly on the man, who, because he chose to cleave to the woman, must now support her. Because he made himself the slave of her wishes, he must now be the servant of her wants.

It cannot be denied that the ground on which we live is still cursed ; that mankind eat of its fruits in sorrow all the days of their life : that it still spontaneously produces thorns and thistles : or, that mankind earn their bread in the sweat of their face.

It cannot be denied, that all mankind are now mortal, or that they return unto the dust from whence they were taken.

Dangers stand thick through all the ground,
To push us to the tomb ;
And fierce diseases wait around
To hurry mortals home.

Some men may impute this to our personal transgressions. The original cause, however, is, that “ by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin ; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” This is abundantly

† Gen. iii. 17, 19.

confirmed, as we have seen, by the sufferings and mortality of infants. Pain is the chastisement or punishment, and death is the wages, of sin. But these have no personal crime, on account of which they suffer, or die. Yet “death reigned from Adam to Moses (and still reigns) over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.”

In all this we find a gracious commutation of wholesome chastisement for destructive punishment. A commutation founded on the sentence which God first pronounced on the Serpent. Wholesome chastisement this certainly was.—Hard labour, though once unnecessary, was now become wholesome: wholesome to the body, the constitution of which now needed it for the preservation of health; and to the mind, which now, not naturally inclined to employ itself in the contemplation of its Maker, needed some innocent occupation to prevent the further increase of sin.—Pain and sorrow were now become as necessary and as wholesome as labour. Unmingled bliss might agree with spotless innocence, and was once a suitable proof of the unqualified approbation of their Creator. But pain was a necessary appendage of sin, and was adapted to remind them of their fall and of their loss of the Divine approbation. When, before their fall, they lived in the actual enjoyment of God, they were thereby morally *drawn* towards him, and led to make him the supreme object of their choice; but when, by their sin, they were robbed of their proper portion, the sufferings and sorrows of sin were necessary to *drive* them to him. They were, therefore, wisely left under the *physical* effects of their fall, until they should be completely recovered from its *moral* and *judicial* consequences. And their expulsion from Paradise, and from the tree of life, with all that it implied, was a proper and standing evidence of the judicial sentence which still hung over them.

Their state was now that of moral agents under the displeasure of their Maker, but under a gracious dispensation by which they might be restored: and with this all the circumstances of their new situation were in perfect accord.

The external circumstances of mankind are now precisely those of fallen Adam. The human race are now surrounded with natural evil, and continually exposed to sufferings. “Man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upwards.”* If he enter at all “into the kingdom of God,” it must be “through much tribulation.”† It is not necessary to recount here,

The heart-ache, and the thousand natural shocks,
That flesh is heir to.

The heart knoweth its own bitterness.—This *natural* evil is the product of *moral* evil. Suffering is the concomitant of sin. These sorrows are the consequences of a breach of a former covenant, and are as truly the marks of legal condemnation, as the sufferings of our first parents. They are intended,—to corroborate the divine testimony concerning the moral and relative state of mankind,—to make us conscious of our real situation,—and to prepare us to receive the Deliverer from sin and sorrow :—and they will continue till, when we are completely saved from sin,

Our mourning is all at an end :

when these that “have come through much tribulation, shall have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.” In the mean time, while they answer these important ends, “it is good for us to have been afflicted.”

The more closely we examine the present condition of human nature, the more we shall be convinced, that it is precisely that into which our first parents were brought by their fall, and by the new covenant which was then made with them through the seed of the woman. We have the same marks of our loss of the blessings of the covenant of innocence, the same indications of the judicial sentence which hangs over us; and we, like them, are under a new covenant by which provision is made for our recovery.

* Job. v. 7.

† Acts xiv. 22.

1. Nothing can less need to be proved than that Adam by his sin forfeited his paradise, and the ease and enjoyments to which it contributed. “The **LORD** God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubim, and a flaming sword.”*—If Adam had not sinned, he and his posterity would undoubtedly have continued to inhabit the garden of Eden: but since his fall, no individual of the human race has been admitted. The case then is perfectly plain, that his *posterity* have lost it by *his* sin.

2. Our first parent forfeited *the Tree of Life*, and its *immortalizing fruit*, together with his paradise. “And now,” said the **LORD** God, “lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and *live for ever*; therefore the **LORD** God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, and placed Cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, *to keep the way of the tree of life.*”† When Adam was placed in the garden of Eden, he had leave to “eat freely of every tree of the garden,” of which *the tree of life* was one, with the exception only of “the tree of knowledge of good and evil.”‡ But who will say, that the *posterity* of Adam are at liberty to eat the fruit of the tree of life?

3. Whatever were the benefits of which a paradise and the tree of life are the *symbols* and *pledges*, they were forfeited with them. The sin of Adam separated between God and him. He was therefore robbed, as we have seen, of the gracious presence of God. He forfeited the divine light, and sunk into spiritual darkness. He forfeited the divine assistance, and sunk into spiritual debility. He forfeited the divine favour and approbation, and the proofs of that favour and approbation; and was therefore afraid, and hid himself from that God in whose presence he had otherwise rejoiced. He forfeited that communion with God, and that enjoyment of him, which were the life of his life; and became wretched and forlorn.—All these we have already found to be the consequences of his fall, with respect to his posterity: of

* Gen. iii. 23, 24.

† Gen. iii. 23, 24.

‡ Gen. ii. 16, 17.

whom none has God with him or in him, none is enlightened or accepted, none beholds the love of God towards him, or enjoys fellowship with God, but in and through Jesus Christ the *Mediator of the new covenant*.—These are undeniable facts. Here are a race of beings, by their very constitution capable of God, whose first parent had God for his portion, and forfeited that desirable treasure by preferring a creature before his Creator, and who now do not inherit from him his primeval portion. Why are they robbed of it, but because it was forfeited by their head and representative, whose sin has placed some obstacle in the way of their enjoyment of it?

It remains only to add, that mankind are now, like their first parents, under a gracious covenant which *supposes* their *fallen* condition; which is *adapted* to their condition as *fallen*; which is *designed* for their *restoration*; and to which it is to be attributed that any of the human race are enlightened, accepted, renewed, or saved.

The seed of the woman, who, in behalf of Adam, was appointed to bruise the serpent's head, is manifested, in behalf of *mankind*, to destroy the works of the Devil. He, therefore, who was the Saviour of Adam, is the Saviour of all *men*, and “there is none other name under heaven, given among men whereby we can be saved.”

1. He came into the world *on the supposition that we were fallen*. “The Son of man is come to save that which was LOST.*—This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save SINNERS.†—When we were yet SINNERS, Christ died for us.—He died for the UNGODLY.‡—He died the just for the UNJUST, that he might bring us to God.|| But he, by the grace of God, tasted death *for every man.*”§ Therefore all men were sinners, ungodly, and unjust.

2. The method of our salvation by Jesus Christ is *adapted to us as fallen creatures*. Jesus Christ is “the light of the world” because, without him, the world is “full of darkness and cruel habitations.” He became a “propitia-

* Matt. xviii. 11. † 1 Tim. i. 15. § Rom. v. 6, 8.

|| 1 Pet. iii. 18. § Heb. ii. 9.

tion for the sins of the whole world,"* because "judgment had come upon all men to condemnation, every mouth was stopped, and all the world was become guilty before God."† He required that all men should be *regenerated*, because all men are deeply *degenerated*; and he testified, "Except a man be *born* of water and of the Spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God,"‡ because "that which is born of the flesh is flesh (is carnal,) and that only which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (is spiritual.) His Apostle insisted that "in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature?"|| because "the *old man* is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and the *new man* only is created after God in righteousness and true holiness."§ And God has "laid help upon one who is mighty," because "without him we can do nothing."

3. The terms of the new covenant are such as are adapted for our *restoration*, and therefore imply our antecedent *ruin*. (1.) The gospel says to every one, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Now repentance is required as a mean of raising the fallen. Jesus Christ "came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance; for they that are whole have no need of a Physician, but they that are sick." Repentance then is only the duty of a sinner; and is intended in order to his cure. "But God commandeth *all men every where* to repent,"¶ and therefore all men every where are sinners. The gospel of Jesus Christ is the gospel of repentance, and, therefore, is intended to promote the cure of the diseased. (2.) It requires "faith in them that hear it."** God, as of old, has "sent his word to heal" us. †† Jesus Christ, therefore, required that men should have "faith to be healed;" ‡‡ for faith is the mean by which we depend on the Physician of souls, receive his advice and his medicines, and by which we are consequently made whole. (3.) All men are taught by Jesus Christ to pray, and to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses." This implies that all men have committed trespasses, and that the

* 1 John ii. 2.

† Rom. iii. 19.

‡ John iii. 5.

|| Gal. vi. 15.

§ Eph. iv. 22, 24.

|| Acts xvii. 30.

** Heb. iv. 2.

¶ Psalm cxvii. 20.

‡‡ Acts xiv. 9.

gospel is intended to direct all men to the forgiveness of sins. (1.) “If any man will come after me,” said Jesus Christ, “let him deny himself.”* This implies that there is something in every man, which it is necessary for him to deny or renounce; and that the peculiar duty of a Christian is such as is adapted to save him from his sinful self.

4. It is to be attributed to the healing nature of the gospel covenant that any man is enlightened, accepted, renewed, delivered, quickened, or finally redeemed and saved.—(1.) The wisest of men have once been ignorant, and are *supernaturally* illuminated. “Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord.”† (2.) All the people of God are they whose iniquities are forgiven. They are “accepted in the beloved, in whom they have redemption through his blood the forgiveness of sins.”‡ “The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.”|| “For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.”§ (3.) All the holy people of God, are those who are renewed in the spirit of their mind. “We ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour towards man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ, our Saviour.”¶ (4.) All the free servants of God are liberated captives. “He gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.”** (5.) The bodies of the followers of Christ are brought back from the tomb, by virtue of the death and resurrection of their redeeming Head. “Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam

* Matt. xvi. 24. † Eph. v. 8. ‡ Eph. i. 6, 7. || Gal. iii.

§ Rom. xi. 32. ¶ Tit. iii. 3. ** Tit. i. 14.

all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.”* (6.) All the spirits of just men made perfect, ascribe their salvation to Jesus the Mediator of a *new* covenant. “ Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen. †—Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation. ‡—What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?—These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb. ||—And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father’s name written in their foreheads.—These were redeemed from among men, being the first-fruits unto God, and to the Lamb.” §—In a word: All our blessings are the gifts, not of nature, but of grace: they are not our *paternal inheritance*, but a “*purchased possession*,” restored to us by him who came into the world to save sinners. “ Of him are we in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord,” Jesus Christ. ¶

It may possibly be urged that there are *exceptions*: that Jeremiah was “sanctified before he came forth out of the womb,” ** and that John the Baptist was “filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother’s womb.” ††—If these were really exceptions, they would only confirm the general rule: for admitting that the purification of their souls from their birth, is what is meant, this does not contradict the general statement. (1.) These expressions do not imply that the purity of Jeremiah and John was the result of their natural constitution, but rather that it was the gift of redeeming grace. (2.) If all mankind were sanctified from their birth, there would be no room for marking these as extraordinary cases.

* 1 Cor. xv. 20, 22. † Rev. i. 5, 6. ‡ Rev. v. 9. || Rev. vii. 13, 15.

§ Rev. xiv. 1, 4. ¶ 1 Cor. i. 30, 31. ** Jer. i. 5. †† Luke i. 15.

In attending to the objections which the Socinians generally urge against these scriptural truths, it is reasonable to enquire whether Mr. G. do not first demand our attention. Although he has not entered thoroughly into this subject, he has given us a fair specimen of the manner in which he would oppose it. His objections are taken entirely from scripture, and are undoubtedly some of the strongest which he has to produce. If we can fairly answer them, we may justly presume, that whatever others he may have in store, are equally answerable. We will not conjecture the cause of his giving us the texts without any comment; but will briefly subjoin to each of them, what we deem an appropriate and satisfactory answer.

"For thy *pleasure* they are and were *created*."*—Undoubtedly. But Mr. G. will not affirm that all God's creatures have answered the end for which they were created. Some of them have proved extremely wicked. Has God then "any *pleasure* in *wickedness*?" If Mr. G. mean to insinuate that the degeneracy of mankind cannot give God pleasure, we answer, Certainly it cannot. But the passage which he has quoted, speaks of their creation. He must remember that all which God *created* and made, was "created in six days," after which God "rested from his works." Now God did not *create* any thing sinful, as Mr. G. will inform us by his next quotation.

"And God saw every thing that he had made, and behold it was *very good*."†—Equally true! But what has this to do with their *subsequent state*? Adam and Eve were very good when God made them, and when he approved the work of his hands; but were they very good when they ate of the forbidden fruit? And are all their posterity very good until now?

"He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things."‡—How does this passage prove that none of God's gifts are legally forfeited? or that the gifts which we enjoy are not given according to the law of redeeming grace? "Eternal life is the gift of God" to sinners; but it is given "through Jesus Christ our Lord," and Redeemer.

* Vol. II. p. 122. Rev. iv. 11. † Vol. II. p. 123. Gen. i. 31. ‡ Acts xvii. 25.

“Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven.”*—Who was it that spake these words? Was it not the *Saviour of sinners?* How then does this passage prove that little children have no need of the Saviour of sinners? Jesus Christ saves them, and therefore of such is the kingdom of heaven. Can this prove that they have *no need of being saved?*—But wait a moment.

“Verily, I say unto you, whosoever receiveth not the kingdom of God as a *little child*, shall in no wise enter therein.”†—The true meaning of this passage appears to be, that no person can enter into the kingdom of God, but in that spirit of docility which a little child *ordinarily* manifests in its general conduct. Whether these little children, without Christ, be lost, the Reader will immediately understand.

“For their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.”—To these words Jesus Christ adds, “For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost.”‡ Hence it appears that these “little ones” were *lost*, but that Jesus Christ *saves* them.

“God is love.”—We have found it useful to turn to the passage which Mr. G. cites, and to read a little further, and will, therefore, again make the same experiment. We turn to this passage, (1 John iv. 8, &c.) and read:—“God is love. In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, *not that we loved God*, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.”—Mr. G. did not intend that we should pry so narrowly into every thing. Here, however, is St. John’s own explanation of his own words, “God is love.” According to this explanation, how does it appear from this passage that we *did* love God; that we had *no sins* for which a *propitiation* was necessary; or that we should all have *lived* without the coming of his only begotten Son into the world?

* Matt. xix. 14, &c.

† Mark x. 15.

‡ Matt. xviii. 10.

“ His tender mercies are over all his works.” *—Most certainly! But how is this to prove that *all mankind* have *not need* of his *tender mercies*?

What remain are totally irrelevant. At least they may stand without any reply. They are such as these:—“ Not a sparrow falleth to the ground without your Father.—His compassions fail not.—He will not always chide.—His mercy endureth for ever.” †—All full of consolation for the faithful; but nothing to the point in hand!

If Mr. G. understand how to quote scripture against us, we may expect but a feeble resistance from that quarter. It is when a Socinian assumes the *philosopher*, that he becomes formidable; for then he is at home. If we are worsted by meeting him on his own ground, it is some consolation that we have a scriptural battery, behind which we can retire. While we keep our proper place of retreat in our rear, we may venture to face the danger, and to attend to the philosophical objections which are made to this scriptural doctrine.

I. “ It is impossible in the nature of things that man should be *created* holy. All holiness must be the effect of a man’s own *choice*, and *endeavour*. It must be the result of a *right use* of his powers. Adam could not therefore be holy, till he had thus exerted his powers aright.”

It is very justly observed, that those who are adverse to the doctrine of human depravity, are equally so to that of the original rectitude of our first parents. The reason is obvious; for the one cannot be safely denied, if the other be admitted. If Adam were created in a state of positive moral rectitude, it would rest with the Socinians to prove that every man is born into the world in a similar state. This would be too much for even their philosophy. For the same reason it is necessary for us to prove the possibility of Adam’s original rectitude.

1. The first and best proof which we give, is that taken from the scriptures which affirm that so it was.

(1.) Moses expressly states, that “ God said, Let us make man *in our own image*.” ‡

* Psalm cxlv.9.

† Vol. II. p. 123, 124.

‡ Gen. i. 26.

(2.) When God had finished all his works, he pronounced them all to be “very good.” *

(3.) Solomon consequently declares that “God made man upright.” †

But if the first of these texts imply only, that man was made with reason and choice, (which is not yet granted,) the second and third must imply that those powers had a proper direction. To argue then that the thing is impossible, is to argue against plain scriptural facts.

“ That righteousness, or holiness, is the principal part of this image of God, appears from Eph. iv. 22, 24. and Col. iii. 9, 10. On which it may be observed, [1.] By the *old man* is not meant a *Heathenish life*, or an ungodly conversation; but a *corrupt nature*. For the Apostle elsewhere speaks of *our old man* as *crucified with Christ*; and here distinguishes from it their *former conversation*, or sinful actions, which he calls the *deeds of the old man*. [2.] By ‘the new man’ is meant, not a new course of life, (as the Socinians interpret it) but a *principle of grace*, called by St. Peter the *hidden man of the heart*, and a *divine nature*. [3.] To *put off the old man* (the same as to crucify the flesh) is to subdue and mortify our corrupt nature: to *put on the new man* is to stir up and cultivate that gracious principle, that new nature. *This*, saith the Apostle, is *created after God*, in righteousness and true holiness. It is *created*: which cannot properly be said of a *new course of life*; but may of a *new nature*. It is *created after God*, or *in his image* and *likeness*, mentioned by Moses. But what is it to be *created after God*, or *in his image*? It is to be created in *righteousness* and true *holiness*: (termed *knowledge*, the practical knowledge of God, Col. iii 10.) But if to be *created after God*, or in his *image* and *likeness*, is to be *created in righteousness* and true *holiness*, and if that principle of righteousness and holiness by which we are ‘*created unto good works*,’ is a *new man*, a *divine nature*: it is easy to infer, that man was at first *created righteous or holy*.” ‡

2. This Socinian mistake arises from confounding a right state of the powers of the mind with a right use of

* Gen. i. 31. † Eccles. vii. 29. ‡ Mr. S. Hebrew's Tract on Eccles. vii. 29.

them, or with those *habits* which are contracted only by use. It is readily granted that Adam could not *act* aright but by his own *choice* and endeavour, and that he could not contract *habits* of holiness without a series of right actions. But the right *state* of his powers is another thing, and was *antecedent* to his choice and endeavour. A rational and free being, not only may, but must, begin his existence with his powers either in order, or in disorder, as every living human body must be produced with either a healthy, or a sickly constitution; for there is no medium. Could not God create a human body with eyes capable of seeing clearly and distinctly? with senses to which what is useful would be agreeable, and what is baneful would be unpleasant, and the result of the first exertion of which would be a choice of the good, and a refusal of the evil? And why could not God create a human being with the powers of his mind in such a state as immediately to view in a proper light every thing which should come under his notice,—to distinguish between the Creator and his creatures,—to perceive immediately the vast superiority of God to all other things,—and to have a distaste to sin, and a natural relish for piety? And would not the result of the first exertion of such powers in such a state, be a choice of God for his portion, and of the Divine will for the law of his being?

The further we pursue this subject, the more clearly we perceive that so it must have been. Suppose man to be created with his *senses* unfit for use:—how could he fit them for use by using them, since they could not be used until they were fit for use? Can a blind man obtain power to see, by seeing? He cannot see, until he be blessed with power to see.—Again: suppose (if it be not a contradiction in terms,) a man created with appetites which make no distinction between pleasant and unpleasant, wholesome and baneful. Before he can distinguish between food and poison, he must make the trial of both: and as his appetite is not antecedently disposed to distinguish, he will not only try but eat both indifferently. He will be poisoned before he can know the difference. If he make any choice between them, it must be merely accidental, for he has no judgment

to guide him. His “mouth does (not) taste meat.” He may accidentally give the decided preference to poison, and reject salutary food. Suppose that the poison do not take immediate effect, and he make repeated experiments whereby he may contract habits of distinction, and a true taste: —it is as probable that, without any fault of his, he will contract a *false* taste as that he will contract a *just* one.—The Reader has already learned to make the application.

Love to God is the essence of the duty of a rational creature. And why could not man be created in a state of mind and heart constitutionally disposed to love God, as the human eye, when not disordered, finds it “a pleasant thing to behold the sun,” or as the human palate is previously disposed to be gratified by wholesome food?

But here is the difficulty! “Man (it is said) could not love God before he knew him.”

Very true. But, according to St. Paul’s explanation of the image of God, man was *created* in *knowledge* as well as in *love*. He at once *knew* and *loved* God, at the moment of his creation. Suppose a human being called into existence, not in midnight darkness, but in the light of the meridian sun, with his eyes open and perfect. In the very moment of his creation he beholds the sun, and admires it above every visible object. Just so, Adam, created with his mental powers in their perfect state, in the blaze of Deity, at once knew God and loved him.

3. It is very obvious that the objection which we have been considering, is founded in a mistaken notion of the nature of the things in question. The idea of what is *possible* is taken from what generally *is*. Because, in the present state of things, mankind come into existence very imperfect, it is taken for granted that so it must always have been. But is not this begging the question, by supposing the original state of human nature to have been the same as the present? The present state of things is not, however, such as to afford no proof of the possibility of Adam’s being created in a state of holiness.

(1.) The human nature of *Jesus Christ* was produced *holly*. Hence the angel *Gabriel* said unto *Mary*, “The

Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee, therefore also that HOLY THING which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." *—Now if it were *impossible* for a being to be made *constitutionally holy*, Jesus Christ could not have been born a HOLY THING.

(2.) When a man is *renovated* in the spirit of his mind, the disposition to holiness *precedes* the choice and practice of holiness. The Socinians grant that *habits* are formed by long continued practices, and that these habits dispose a person to *prolong* the practices out of which they arise. How then can a man who has contracted violent habits of wickedness, which have become "a second nature," enter on the practice of holiness, without a previous *choice* of the path of holiness? and how can he chuse the path of holiness without a *disposition* to make that choice? The bent of his mind is directly contrary to such a choice: it is a disposition to chuse the way of sin. Unless his *disposition*, therefore, first be changed, there will be no change in his *choice*, and consequently none in his *practice*. However the disposition may be *confirmed* by the subsequent choice and practice, it must *precede* them. Hence the sacred writers do not attribute the change of a man's heart to a change in his conduct; but the change in his conduct to that of his heart. "A good man out of the *good treasure* of the *heart*, bringeth forth good things." † "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" ‡ "How can ye, being *evil*, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the *heart* the mouth speaketh." || "Make the *tree* good, and the *fruit* will be good also; or else make the *tree* corrupt, and his *fruit* corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit." §—And this change of *heart*, so necessary to a change of *conduct*, implies not only a change of *choice*, but also a previous change of *disposition*: a change of disposition which, because it must *precede* a change of choice, is primarily attributed, not to him who is the subject of it, but to *God*. "We are *his* workmanship, *created* in Christ Jesus *unto good works*,

* Luke i. 35. † Matt. xii. 35. ‡ Matt. vii. 16.

|| Matt. xii. 34. § Matt. xii. 33.

which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” *

According to this doctrine, Adam was “*created unto good works*, that he might walk in them.” It is perhaps no mean proof of this, that he lived a life of perfect holiness from the beginning: and sinned not till he met with an *external temptation*. The present state of mankind we have found to be the reverse of this. They are “*transgressors from the womb*:” and never turn from their unrighteousness till they are solicited by grace divine.

II. “If Adam had been created perfect he could not have fallen. His fall demonstrates that he was not perfect.”

The fallacy of this argument lies in the ambiguity of the term, *perfect*. It may mean *absolute perfection*, and may include *immutability*. Taking the word in this sense, the proposition is a *truism*: it is the same thing as if the objector had said, ‘If Adam had been made incapable of falling, he could not have fallen.’ But, as we do not contend for such a perfection in our first parent, the objection is irrelevant. It should have been said, ‘If Adam had been created *upright*, he could not have *fallen*?’ But then the objection would have carried absurdity on the face of it: and would have suggested the answer, ‘Man could not have *fallen*, unless he had been created *upright*.—The truth is, that Adam was created perfect *in a certain sense*. His was the perfection of a *dependent being* so constituted as to be fit for a *fair probation*; and, therefore, capable of falling, though not already fallen. Such a perfection Adam could not possess, *without* a possibility of falling. If he could not sin, he could not freely obey; and, therefore, he could not have been tried whether he would sin or obey.

The objection, however, in the mind of the objector, implies the *impossibility* of any moral change in a created being who has received a previous determination. It implies that a *wicked man* cannot *turn from* his wickedness to do that which is lawful and right; and that a *righteous man* cannot *turn from* his righteousness and do iniquity. It is unnecessary to quote the scriptures to which we have now alluded,

* Eph. ii. 9, 10.

in proof of the mutability of the determination of a moral agent. As truly as a *wicked* man may *turn from his wickedness*, and a *righteous* man may *turn from his righteousness*, Adam might be created with a *right determination*, or be created a *righteous man*, and afterwards *turn from his righteousness*: he might be made *upright*, and yet subsequently *fall*.

III. “It is impossible for man to be born in sin, for sin is the *voluntary* abuse of one’s powers.”

To this we answer :

1. The scriptures uniformly assert, that man is “shapen in iniquity,” and “conceived in sin;”—that “man cannot be clean who is born of a woman;”—and that “that which is born of the flesh is flesh,” and needs to “be born of the Spirit” before it can enter the kingdom of heaven. To contradict this statement, is, therefore, to contradict the plainest assertions of scripture.

2. Here is the same confusion on which we have remarked in the counterpart of this objection. It makes no distinction between a wrong *choice*, and a wrong *disposition*,—between the wrong *state*, and the wrong *use*, of our powers. That man cannot be born with any thing which implies a wrong *choice* already made, is obvious. Perhaps it will be granted, that we have *no innate ideas*, and therefore, as principles are compounded of ideas, that we have *no innate moral principles*. But may there not be a disorder of the faculties, before those faculties are called into action? We easily grant the possibility of the birth of a human body disordered in any of its senses or members, or in all of them. A human body may be born blind, or deaf, or dumb, or maimed, or lame. Again : A man may be born with a false taste, which exists before either food or poison has been presented to him; and, therefore, before his taste has been vitiated by the use of poison. Now where is the impossibility of the mental powers being produced in *disorder*? Why *must* they of necessity be in proper order and harmony? Why is it impossible that the understanding should be naturally blind, and the passions headstrong? What reason is to be assigned in proof that the taste (shall we call

it) cannot be naturally false, and give a wrong bias to the subsequent choice?

IV. "Do you not make God the author of sin, by supposing that he brings every human being into the world in a state of sinful depravity? The proper production of a child is from God. But if God produces a *fetus* which has sinful dispositions, he produces those dispositions."

"This argument proves too much. It would prove God to be the author of all *actual*, as well as *original*, (or hereditary) sin. For it is the power of God, under certain laws and established rules, which produces not only the *fetus*, but all the *motion* in the universe. It is his power which so violently expands the air, on the discharge of a pistol or cannon. It is the same which produces muscular motion, and the circulation of all the juices in man. But does he therefore produce adultery or murder? Is he the cause of those *sinful motions*? He is the cause of the *motion*, (as he is of the *fetus*;) of the *sin* he is not.—Do not say this is too fine a distinction. Fine as it is, you must necessarily allow it. Otherwise you make God the direct author of all the sin under heaven. To apply this more directly to the point. God does produce the *fetus* of man, as he does of trees, empowering the one and the other, to propagate each after its kind. And a *sinful man* propagates, after his kind, another *sinful man*. Yet God *produces*, in the sense above mentioned, *the man*, but not *the sin*,"*

V. "You make a very good *apology* for the wickedness of mankind. If they be naturally disposed to sin, their sin is the necessary consequence of that disposition. How then can they be justly blamed for what is unavoidable?"

That the *natural depravity* of the human soul is unavoidable, we grant; but not that the *personal wickedness* of every man is unavoidable. Nothing but universal depravity can account for universal wickedness; and universal wickedness would be the *necessary consequence* of universal depravity *if there were no cure for it*. But "the grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, teaching them that denying (renouncing) ungodliness and

* Mr. J. Wesley on Orig. Sin.

worldly lusts, they should live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works." * Under these circumstances, mankind are placed in a state of personal probation: with this difference however:—Adam was created *upright*, and was proved whether he would *fall*; we are born prone, and, under a remediate law, are proved whether we will rise. He sinned voluntarily against the *law of innocence*; we sin voluntarily against the *law of grace*. He sinned and induced the *disorder*; we sin partly by neglecting the *remedy*, and partly in consequence of that neglect. Our *disease* is *unavoidable*; but not so our *neglect* of the *cure*.

VI. "Such a dispensation can never be reconciled with the justice of the divine administrations. How can all mankind justly suffer, for the sin of one person?"

The undeniable fact is, that all mankind do actually suffer by the sin of Adam. Nor is there in this world any condition of human nature, of which we have any knowledge, in which many do not suffer by the fault of others. Nothing is more common than for children to suffer by the folly, extravagance, intemperance, or wickedness of their parents. Did not the progeny of Ham, the families of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and the children of Gehazi, suffer by the sin of their parents? And he whose commandments are *holy*, and *just*, and *good*, speaks of himself as "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth (generation) of them that hate him." † From whence then has the objector learned, that it is *unjust* that one should suffer by the fault of another? Not from the actual state of mankind, or from the sacred scriptures. To give even plausibility to the objection, it must be stated in a very different form.—Say then, "It would be unjust for mankind to suffer unavoidably and finally, without remedy, and without advantage, in consequence of the sin of Adam." But in this shape the objection becomes irre-

* Tit. ii. 11—13.

† Exod. xx. 5.

levant; because on that very ground on which Adam was reprieved, a provision was made for the conditional absolution of each individual of his immense family. His reprieve opened indeed the door for their birth and personal existence in a state of thraldom, as it was derived from him; but not without a simultaneous provision for their deliverance. The declaration that "the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head," was not so much a promise to Adam, as a denunciation upon the serpent, the enemy, not of Adam only, but of all his progeny: and was a prediction of the conditional deliverance of the whole human race. But it was a benefit to mankind, not indeed through the first Adam, by *birth*, but through the second Adam, by *grace*. By that divine declaration therefore, all mankind were placed on new ground. Each individual has an interest in it, by which he is saved from final and unconditional destruction, and by which, while a remedy is provided for the disorder unconditionally entailed on him, a possibility is secured of its turning to his advantage. Hence whatever, in the present stage of human existence, individuals may suffer through the disobedience of their first parents; no one merely on that account can suffer finally and eternally.

Although all mankind are involved in the penal consequences of the sin of Adam, the original promise of a Redeemer, which was the ground of the reprieve of our offending parent, or rather the fulfilment of that promise, has arrested the general sentence of condemnation: and while it conditionally saves the whole progeny of man from final ruin, it gives them great advantage. This consolatory truth we learn not only from the general tenor of the gospel of Jesus Christ, but especially from that parallel, or rather antithesis, which St. Paul has produced between the consequences of the offence of the first Adam, and those of the *obedience unto death* of the second Adam. "Adam was the figure of him that was to come. By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead; *much more* the grace of God, and the gift

by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by *one* to condemnation; but the free gift is of *many* offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; *much more* they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ. Therefore, as by the offence of one, or rather δι' ενος παρεπωμένων, by one offence, (judgment came) upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, or δι' ενος δικαιωμάτων, by one righteousness, (the gift came) upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.—Where sin abounded, grace did *much more* abound. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign, through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord."*

If this apostolical mode of reasoning be appropriate, the present economy of God, so far from being unjust, is abundantly merciful. The benefits accruing to mankind through the gift of God by grace, must not, however, divert our attention from our subject. If righteousness and life come by Christ; it is because sin and death first came by Adam. (v. 12.) The grace of God, and the gift by grace, have abounded unto many; because through the offence of one many are dead. (v. 15.) The free gift is of many offences unto justification; because first the judgment was by one to condemnation. (v. 16.) If they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ; by one man's offence, death first reigned over them by one. (v. 17.) The righteousness of one is upon all men unto justification of life; because by the offence of one (judgment came) upon all men to condemnation. (v. 18.) If by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous; by one man's disobedience many were made sinners. (v. 19.) And if grace reign through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus

* Rom. v. 12—21.

Christ; sin had first reigned unto death. (v. 21.) The strength and extent of the remedy, prove the inveteracy and extent of the disease.

VII. "At this rate you destroy the work of your own hands. You first suppose that all mankind are depraved and ruined, and then that they are all renewed and restored. But if all men are renewed and restored in Jesus Christ, how can they be depraved and ruined in Adam?"

We answer:

1. If mankind were personally justified and sanctified in Christ Jesus, it would imply that they are *otherwise* depraved and ruined; for if this were not the case, they would not need the mediation of Jesus Christ.

2. All mankind are in such a sense justified through Jesus Christ, as not to perish, finally and eternally, merely on account of Adam's sin. Hence they are placed in a state of probation, in which they have an opportunity for seeking and finding both a personal interest in "the grace of God," and a personal participation of "the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ." In the mean time, they are not so justified as to avoid all the consequences of the sin of their first parent; as not to need a personal union with Jesus Christ; as not to be called to seek such an union with *him*; or as not to be finally condemned for their own sin, if they wilfully neglect to embrace the Saviour and his salvation.

3. Mankind are not *necessarily* regenerated or sanctified in Christ Jesus. If this were the case, the fall of their parent would not account for their personal sinfulness. But the means of their regeneration and sanctification, are provided and set before them. They are unclean; but a fountain is opened in the house of David for sin and for uncleanness, in which they may wash and be clean. They are not whole, but diseased; and therefore have need of a Physician: and there is balm in Gillead, there is a Physician there, by whom all that come to him, whatever be their diseases, may be made whole.—These observations leave room, however, for another objection.

VIII. "If all mankind are guilty and depraved, how can dying infants be made partakers of the kingdom of heaven? You grant the latter, and therefore must give up the former."

There is nothing inconsistent between the ruin and depravity of infants by the sin of their parents, and their being finally saved by Jesus Christ. "If, by the offence of one, judgment came upon them to condemnation; so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift comes upon them unto justification of life." However necessary it may be that they who, by personal sin, have confirmed the original sentence of condemnation, should seek and accept a personal interest in Christ; it cannot be necessary for those who have committed no personal sin, and who have never been capable of a personal application of the merit of the Saviour.—As to their participation of human depravity: They have never, by an unholy choice or deed, given themselves up to its government; and therefore, dying in personal innocence, they may be renewed by an operation of the Holy Spirit, which does not require, as in the case of adults, their personal co-operation.—Their ruin has been effected without their personal fault; and their recovery is effected without their personal choice.

As the depravity and ruin of mankind are clearly and decisively demonstrated, in the sacred scriptures, to be the natural and judicinal consequences of the sin of their first parents; the whole *Socinian* system must fall to the ground. The rational Divines must relinquish their confidence in the infallibility of human reason,—grant that a Divine Redeemer and Restorer is necessary,—submit to the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice,—and acknowledge their want of a supernatural influence on their minds and hearts, in order to their salvation. They must renounce their boasts of the moral dignity of human nature.—rank themselves with publicans and sinners,—and condescend to be saved by *grace*.—Nor will they hereby lose any thing but their unreasonable prejudices, and their destructive sins.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of the Miraculous Conception of Jesus Christ.

To bring this doctrine under suspicion, Mr. G. has given us, from Dr. Watts, “the principles and rules of judgment, by which men are influenced in deciding upon matters of human testimony.”* His rules are not, however, exactly applicable to the present case. There is a considerable difference between those facts on the evidence of which we receive the doctrines of Christianity; and those of which we are thereby certified. Our Lord and his Apostles wrought miracles in confirmation of their testimony. These were public and notorious. But they have related many facts which can be ascertained only on the credit of their testimony; because the nature of them is inconsistent with public notoriety. We cannot expect the same evidence of our Lord’s transfiguration, which we have of his resurrection: and it would be still more unreasonable to expect that the miraculous conception, a thing necessarily private, should be attested equally with our Lord’s public miracles.

The evidence which we have of this part of sacred history, is contained principally in the accounts which the Evangelists Matthew and Luke have given us, in the two first chapters of their respective gospels. “If these chapters be genuine, that is, written by Matthew and Luke, their authenticity, that is, the truth of the facts recorded, (as Mr. G. justly observes) must follow; the general authenticity of these writers being fully established.”†

Whether these chapters be genuine, it shall now be our business to inquire.

* Vol. II. p. 372, &c.

+ Vol. II. p. 371.

I. It is not a matter of small importance, that they now make a part of what we receive from our predecessors, as the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Wetstein, Griesbach, and other learned Editors of the New Testament, have admitted them without scruple. They make a constituent part of all the Ancient Versions. With the exception of casual mutilations, such as may take place at the extremity of any manuscript, they are found in all the Ancient Copies, concerning which we have any information.

II. In addition to all this, the early testimony of the Christian fathers, is decisive in favour of their genuineness.

Ignatius, the disciple of John, speaks of Jesus Christ, as being “both of Mary and of God.”* “Jesus Christ, (he says again) was, according to the dispensation of God, conceived in Mary, of the seed of David, by the Holy Ghost.”† —Mr. G. has admitted, that Ignatius believed the miraculous conception. “Ignatius (he says) assigns what we should now deem a ludicrous reason for this concealment, (of the fact in question,) that it might be hidden from the devil.”‡

Justin Martyr, who wrote A. D. 140, makes the following allusions to the passages in both Matthew and Luke :— “An angel was sent to the same virgin, saying: ‘Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb by the Holy Ghost, and thou shalt bring forth a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest. And thou shalt call his name Jesus, (Luke i. 31, 32.) for he shall save his people from their sins.’ (Matt. i. 21.) as they have taught, who have written the history of all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ.”|| Again: “And the virgin Mary having been filled with faith and joy, when the angel Gabriel brought her good tidings, that ‘the Spirit of the Lord should come upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadow her, and therefore, that holy thing born of her should be the Son of God,’—answered, ‘Be it unto me according to thy word.’ (Luke i. 35, 38.)”§

* Epis. ad Eph. sec. 7.

† Sec. 18.

‡ Vol. II. p. 492.
§ Dial. Par. ii.

|| Apol. I.

Irenæus, who wrote A. D. 178, says, “Matthew relates his generation which is according to man: ‘The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham:’”—“The gospel according to Matthew was written to the Jews; for they earnestly desired a Messiah of the seed of David: and Matthew having also the same desire to a yet greater degree, strove by all means to give them full satisfaction, that Christ was of the seed of David; wherefore he began with his genealogy.”—“But the gospel according to Luke, being of a priestly character, begins with Zacharias the priest offering incense to God.”—“There are many, and those very necessary parts of the gospel, which we know only by his (Luke’s) means: as the birth of John, the history of Zacharias, the visit of the angel to Mary, and the descent of the angels to the shepherds.”*

Tertullian, who wrote A. D. 200, says, “The apostles John and Matthew, and apostolic men Luke and Mark, teach us concerning the one God the Creator, and his Christ born of a virgin.”† He asserts the genuineness of the copies of the four gospels which were then held by him, and appeals to all the *apostolic churches* founded by Paul and John, from whom he had received them, in proof of it.‡

It is not necessary to pursue this subject any further. We have here the testimonies of the *earliest* writers of Christian Antiquity, in favour of the doctrine, and of the genuineness, of the chapters in question. Perhaps there are not many particular passages in the New Testament, which, distinctly considered, descend to us with more positive historical evidence: and we may venture to affirm, that the Socinians themselves would loudly proclaim the triumph of the miraculous conception, if it were not so violently at odds with their own system.

III. To corroborate this external evidence, the chapters themselves afford *internal* proof of their genuineness. It divides itself into two parts.

* Euseb. His. Eccles. Lib. III. cap. xi. sec. 8. cap. xxii. sec. 3. E. Pavini Catena Patrum in Matt. 5 apud Massuet, p. 317. Grabe, p. 471. Laird. Cred. P. II. Ch. 17.

† Adv. Marc. Lib. IV. cap. 2. ‡ Ibid. cap. 5.

1. Our Lord was called Jesus. This name every Christian has been repeatedly told means a Saviour. That he is eminently “the *Saviour* of all men,” is equally known. Now how came it to pass that he received a name so expressive of his office? Did his parents foresee that he would be a Saviour? They could not without some divine revelation. Where then is that divine revelation recorded? No where but in the account of his miraculous conception. The angel which appeared to Mary said, “Thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.”* And that which afterward appeared to Joseph, said, “She shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall *save* his people from their *sins*.”†—These are the only accounts which we have of the reason for his receiving this appropriate and significant name.

2. Our Lord was always denominated, by those who believed in him, “*the Son of God*.” This appellation, we have seen, was peculiarly expressive of his character. (See p. 148—154.) But universally as this appellation was used, the reason for it is stated no where, but in Luke’s account of the miraculous conception. “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called *the Son of God*.†‡

If these passages be erased, the sacred scriptures will be manifestly imperfect; because they every where call their great subject, by the appropriate name, Jesus, and speak of him constantly as *the Son of God*: and yet in no other place do they state how it came to pass that that appropriate name was, from his childhood, given to him, or assign a reason for his being distinguished by so singular an appellation!—This is, therefore, a strong, collateral proof, that the story of the miraculous conception, and that of the vision of Joseph relative to it, are genuine.

IV. The evidence of the miraculous conception, does not, however, depend entirely on the narratives of Matthew

* Luke i. 31.

† Matt. i. 21.

‡ Luke i. 35.

and Luke. The precise manner in which Jesus Christ was conceived and born, it is true, are recorded only by those Evangelists; but the fact, that his humanity was produced by supernatural means, has the countenance of the scriptures in general.

1. What reason can be assigned for the peculiar manner in which God was pleased originally to promise the coming of the great Deliverer of the human race, unless it were to signify that he should be made of the substance of *woman*, without the concurrence of *man*? Why was he denominated the seed of the *woman*, rather than the seed of the *man* and of the *woman*? How is this question to be answered, but on the supposition of the miraculous conception?

2. It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader, of that prophecy which Matthew has so properly cited from Isaiah: “Behold a *virgin* shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name *Immanuel*:” * “God with us.”

“At the time referred to (in this chapter) the kingdom of Judah, under the government of Ahaz, was reduced very low,” and was threatened by Pekah, king of Israel, and Resin, king of Syria. “In this critical conjuncture, Ahaz was afraid that the enemies who were now united against him must prevail, destroy Jerusalem, end the kingdom of Judah, and annihilate the family of David. To meet and remove this fear, Isaiah is sent from the Lord to Ahaz, to assure him that the counsels of his enemies should not stand; and that they should be utterly discomfited. To encourage Ahaz, he commands him to ask a *sign* or *miracle*, ‘either in the depth or in the height above,’ which should be a pledge that God would, in due time, fulfil the predictions of his servant, as related in the context. On Ahaz humbly refusing to ask any sign, it is immediately added, ‘Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold a *virgin* shall conceive and bear a son,’ &c.†

(1.) It is objected, however, that the original word, *נָזְרָה*, *almah*, does not signify a virgin only; for it is applied Prov. xxx. 19. to signify a young *married* woman.” The

* Isa. vii. 11.

+ Dr. A. Clarke, on Matt. i. 23.

good sense of the reader will tell him that in those words, “the way of a man with a *maid*,” there is no necessity for understanding the latter word as meaning any thing but a *virgin*. “The word **אַלְמָה** *almah*, comes from **אַלְמֹלֵךְ** *alam* to *lie hid, be concealed*. A virgin was called **אַלְמָה** *almah*, because, as a *woman*, she had not been *uncovered*.—This fully applies to the blessed virgin, who said, ‘How can this be, seeing I *know no man?*’*—It is an important confirmation of this, that the LXX. translate it **η ῥαρθενος**, a *virgin*.

(2.) To neutralize this passage, the prophecy contained in it is said to have been fulfilled in the impregnation of “the prophetess,” the wife of Isaiah, as related in the following chapter. Whoever candidly compares the two passages, will see that they relate to two different subjects. Maher-shalal-hash-baz is not the same name as Immanuel. The prophet’s wife bearing a son is not called a *sign*: nor was it a *miracle*; but a thing perfectly *natural*. Much less can it be called such a sign as God offered to give to Ahaz. God offered to produce a miracle of the most stupendous nature, “either in the depth or in the height above;”† whereas this was a thing perfectly common.

3. When St. Paul speaks of the incarnation of the Son of God, he says, “When the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son, *made of a woman*.”‡—We should not have inferred the miraculous conception from this passage, if the Apostle had simply said he was *born* of a woman; for every child of Adam is born of a woman. But to be *made of* a woman is a thing very different, and is no where predicated of any but of *Jesus Christ* only.

V. The principal, peculiar doctrines of the gospel, are such as, considered in their connection with each other, require that the human nature of Jesus Christ should be produced in some extraordinary manner.—For three reasons, especially, it was necessary that his human nature should be without spot of sin.

1. Without the spotless purity of his nature, it could not have “*pleased the Father, that in him should all fulness dwell*.” “The temple of God must be holy:” but especially that tem-

* Dr. A. Clarke, on Matt. i. 23.

† Isaiah vii. 11.

‡ Gal. iv. 1.

ple in which all the Godhead dwells. In him the holy God could not be manifested—the holy Father could not be seen in the Son, unless the Son were holy like the Father. He must, therefore, be eminently “the *Holy One of God*.”

2. Without this spotless purity, he could not have been “the propitiation for our sins.” “Such an High Priest became us, who is *holy, harmless, undefiled*, separate from sinners, who needed not daily to offer up sacrifice, *first for his own sins*, and then for the people’s.”* He could not have been “made sin for us,” but that he “knew no sin.”† He must be “*just*,” who “died for” us “the unjust.”‡ “The blood of Christ could not purge our consciences from dead works,” unless he “offered himself *without spot to God*.”|| We must “have an advocate with the Father,” who is eminently “the *righteous*,” and who “is the propitiation for our sins.”§ He could “take away our sins,” only because “*in him was no sin*.”¶

3. It was necessary that he should be perfectly *holy*, that the *Holy Spirit* might be communicated by him. The Apostles of Jesus Christ laid their hands on the disciples, designating them as the persons for whom they prayed; and the Holy Ghost was given in answer to their prayer. But Jesus Christ *gives* the Holy Spirit. “If any man thirst, said he, let him come to me and drink. This spake he of the *Spirit*.”** Hence that Spirit is denominated “*the Spirit of the Son*.”†† But how, unless he were without spot of sin, could the “Holy Spirit be given to him without measure,” that “out of his fulness all we might receive, and grace on grace?” How could the Corinthians be “sanctified in Christ Jesus,”‡‡ unless Christ Jesus were himself *perfectly holy*?

It appears from these considerations, not on Socinian, but on scriptural principles, that there was an absolute necessity for his being pure from all sin. But “what is man, that he should be clean, and he which is *born of a woman*, that he should be *righteous*?¶¶¶ “How can he be *clean* that

* Heb. vii. 26, 27.

+ 2 Cor. v. 21.

‡ 1 Pet. iii. 18.

|| Heb. ix. 14.

§ 1 John ii. 1.

¶ 1 John iii. 5.

** John vii. 37.

†† Gal. iv. 6.

‡‡ 1 Cor. i. 2.

¶¶¶ Job xv. 14.

is *born of a woman?** There is certainly some difficulty in this. That God can bring a clean thing out of an unclean, is granted. But his power must be exerted in that way which his wisdom chuses. That Jesus Christ was “*clean*,” the scriptures every where maintain; but they never account for this, except by the extraordinary manner of his birth. “The *Holy Ghost* (said the Angel Gabriel) shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that *HOLY THING* which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.” Blot out this, and how shall we account for the *unspotted holiness* of the human nature of Jesus Christ?

Mr. G. has, however, attempted to produce some positive evidence, that the account of the miraculous conception is spurious. His argument is much more remarkable for the confidence with which it is stated, than for its novelty; and may be fairly reduced to the following propositions. 1. “Among the primitive Christians there existed some who were called *Ebionites*, and *Nazarenes*. These were one and the same people, and comprised all the Hebrew Christians.” 2. Those Hebrew Christians “disbelieved the story of the miraculous conception.” 3. “They received only the gospel of the Evangelist Matthew. 4. Their gospel did not contain those chapters which give an account of the miraculous nativity.”†—If this be a just statement of facts, the inferences, that those chapters are *spurious*, and that the story of the miraculous conception is *false*, are not without some degree of probability. But the statement itself is perfectly erroneous.

There is nothing more common than the variety of the applications which, under different circumstances, in distant places, and in process of time, are made of the appellations given to religious sects, whether according to long established custom, or by way of opprobrium. We grant that the Hebrew Christians in the days of St. Paul, were called by the Jews “Nazarenes;” that there was, at a subsequent period, a sect so denominated by the Gentile Christians: and that the Ebionites were sometimes called *Naza-*

* Job xxv. 4.

+ Vol. II. p. 380.—383.

renes. Nor shall we peremptorily deny that those generally denominated *Nazarenes* were on some occasions, because of certain shades of similarity, denominated *Ebionites*. What we assert is, that the Ebionites are sometimes, for very sufficient reasons, distinguished from those who are distinguished as *Nazarenes*: and that the Nazarenes and Ebionites of Ecclesiastical History, did not comprise *all* the Hebrew Christians, but were perfectly distinct from the orthodox Hebrews. If this assertion be founded on glaring facts, the futility of Mr. G.'s argument will be sufficiently apparent.

1. There were, in the days of the Apostles, certain believing Hebrews, who, instructed by the first messengers of Jesus Christ, understood that he had “abolished in his flesh the law of commandments (contained) in ordinances,”* “stood fast in the liberty wherewith he had made them free, and were not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.”† These Hebrews were called by their countrymen, “the sect of the *Nazarenes*.”‡ They were, however, distinguished from those who are so called by the Gentile converts. In his commentary on the propheey of Isaiah, Jerome distinguishes them from those “Nazarenes who observed the law.”|| And though Origen seems to comprehend the whole body of the Hebrew Christians, under the name of *Ebionites*, and affirms, that they adhered to the law of their fathers,§—in another place, where he professes to describe the sects of the Hebrews with the greatest accuracy, he distinguishes between those who, like other Christians, entirely discarded the Mosaic law, and those who retained the observation of the law, with or without any spiritual expositions of it.¶ The first, therefore, could not be intended to be comprehended under the name of *Ebionites* who *adhered* to the law of their fathers.—These, then, are the Hebrew Christians whom, to serve their own purpose, the Socinians attempt to confound with the heretical Nazarenes.

* Eph. ii. 15. † Gal. v. 1, 2. ‡ Acts xxiv. 5. || Jerome on Isa. ix. 1, 2, 3.

§ Contra Cels. lib. II. sec. 1.

¶ Contra Cels. lib. III. sec. 3.

2. The Nazarenes of history were those who, contrary to the design of the gospel, adhered to the law. Jerome says, “To this day a heresy prevails among the Jews * in all the synagogues of the East, who commonly go by the name of Nazarenes; who believe in Christ, the Son of God, born of the Virgin: in whom we ourselves believe. But from a desire of being Jews and Christians both at once, they are neither Jews nor Christians.”† They are sometimes distinguished into two classes. The first seem to be the descendants of those “weak brethren,” who were “zealous for the law of their fathers,” though they believed in Christ. These are mentioned by Jerome, as Nazarenes who observed the law, but despised the traditions of the Pharisees, and thought highly of St. Paul.‡ These are the Hebrews described by Origen, as “retaining the observation of the law in the letter of the precept, admitting, however, the same spiritual expositions of it which were set up by those who discarded it.”||—The second sort of Nazarenes were, apparently, the descendants of those who, in the Apostles’ days, taught the Gentiles, “except ye be circumcised and keep the law, ye cannot be saved:” and inherited their bigotry. These are the Hebrews described by Origen, as “observing the law according to the letter, but rejecting all spiritual expositions of it.”§ Epiphanius describes this sect of the Nazarenes as a set of people hardly to be distinguished from Jews. Jerome distinguishes them from the first sort, as “believing in Christ the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, in whom the orthodox believe; ¶ but as being so bigotted to the Mosaic law, that they were rather to be considered as a Jewish sect than a Christian.”**

3. Although Origen gives the name of *Ebionites* to all the Hebrew sects which adhered to the law of their fathers, perhaps for the sake of giving an opprobrious name to the

* Dr. Horsley thinks “they arose in the second century, from the ashes of the church of *Jerusalem*.” Charge to the Clergy.

† Epis. ad. August. tom. III. fol. 155. B. edit. Froben.

‡ On Isa. ix, 1, 2, 3. and viii. 14, 19, 21. || Con. Cels. lib. II. sec. 3.

§ Ibid.

¶ According to Jerome, “they acknowledged in Christ the Jehovah, God of hosts, of the Old Testament.” On Isa. viii. 13, 14.

** Epist. ad Aug.

Nazarenes; that name is used by some of the writers of antiquity, as belonging to a sect distinct from those whom they call Nazarenes. Epiphanius, in his book on heresies, distinguishes “the Ebionites, as a sect which branched off from the Nazarenes, and appeared not till after the destruction of Jerusalem.”* Eusebius says, “they were so called from the word EBION, which in Hebrew means ‘poor,’ because of the poverty of their understanding.” He distinguishes two sorts of them: Of the first he says, that “they esteemed Christ a simple, common, and mere man, born of Joseph and Mary: but, on account of his improvement in virtue, they thought him a righteous man, and that they deemed the observance of the law indispensably necessary to salvation.” Of the second, he says, “They were called by the same name, and though, avoiding the follies of the other Ebionites, they did not deny that Jesus was born of the virgin and the Holy Ghost, yet they fell into the same impiety with the others; for they did not acknowledge either his Divinity or his pre-existence, or that he was the Word and the Wisdom of the Father. They were also zealous for the observance of the law. Both these, he says, rejected the Epistles of St. Paul, and stigmatized him as a deserter of the law, and a traitor. They used only the gospel according to the Hebrews, and thought meanly of the other gospels.”† Irenaeus also says, that they “disowned the apostle Paul, calling him an apostate from the law.”‡

The evidence already adduced is more than enough to destroy the force of Mr. G.’s grand argument. It already appears that though the Ebionites and the Nazarenes, in consequence of their agreement in some of their opinions, were sometimes confounded; they were, in other respects, distinct sects. Epiphanius says, the Ebionites branched off from the Nazarenes. Jerome says, the Nazarenes “acknowledged in Christ, the Jehovah, God of hosts of the Old Testament.” Eusebius says, the Ebionites “did not even acknowledge either the Divinity or the pre-existence of Christ, but denied him to be the Word and the Wisdom of

* Epiph. Haer. 30. † His. Eccles. lib. III. cap. 21. ‡ Lib. I. cap. 26.

the Father." Jerome says, the Nazarenes thought highly of St. Paul. Eusebius says, the Ebionites all " rejected the Epistles of St. Paul, and deemed him an apostate and a traitor." Irenæus also says, they " disowned the Apostle Paul, and called him an apostate from the law."—It is equally apparent that the Nazarenes were not the orthodox Hebrew Christians: although the name of Nazarenes was first applied as a stigma on the latter. The Nazarenes of Ecclesiastical History *adhered to the law* of their fathers; whereas when Tertullus accused Paul as "a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes," he accused him as one who *despised the law* and "had gone about to profane the temple."* This was one great point of difference between the Nazarenes of Tertullus, and those to whom Mr. G. is so partial.

Having established these distinctions, we proceed to examine Mr. G.'s assertions.

1. He says, "these Hebrew Christians disbelieved the story of the miraculous conception."

We reply: (1.) Jerome says, "the Nazarenes believed in Christ the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, in whom the orthodox believe." (2.) Eusebius says, that one part of the Ebionites "*did not deny* that Jesus was born of the Virgin, and the Holy Ghost."—On Mr. G.'s own hypothesis that "the Nazarenes and Ebionites comprised *all* the Hebrew Christians;" it follows that *many* of the Hebrew Christians did not disbelieve the story of the miraculous conception. The stone, therefore, rolls back on himself with a momentum increased by his labour. He appeals to the Hebrew Christians; and they to whom he exclusively applies those terms, become swift witnesses against him.—Again: Admitting that *some* of the Ebionites disbelieved the story of the miraculous conception, those Ebionites were not the proper Nazarenes; nor were the Nazarenes the *orthodox* Hebrew Christians. The Ebionites were universally stigmatized as heretics; Irenæus says, "they were circumcised and retained the Jewish law, and Jewish customs."† Tertullian says, "it was Ebion's heresy, that he observed and defended circumcision and the law."‡ Jerome speaks

* Acts xxiv. 5, 6.

† Lib. I. cap. 26.

‡ De Praes. Hæret. cap. 33.

of them as a sect “anathematized for their Judaism, and *falsely pretending* to be Christians.”* Epiphanius, according to the translation by Dr. Priestley, says that Ebion “adopted *many more* things than the Jews, in imitation of the Samaritans;” and the Doctor calls the rites which they borrowed from the Samaritans “*abominable* rites.”†—But the opinion of *heretics* cannot decide what were the opinions of the *orthodox*.

2. Mr. G. says, that these Hebrew Christians received only the gospel by St. Matthew, and that it did not contain those chapters which give an account of the miraculous nativity.”

All this may be granted with respect to the Ebionites, but how is it to prove, that the chapters contained in the gospel by St. Matthew held by the orthodox church, which consisted of Jews who “stood fast in the liberty with which Christ had made them free,” and Gentiles who would not “be entangled in the yoke of bondage,” are spurious? If the argument be good, it will prove that the other three gospels, and all the Epistles, are to be rejected. But if the testimony of these sects is not to be admitted against the rest of the Evangelists and Apostles, it is equally vitiated as it relates to the two first chapters of St. Matthew. The Socinians, therefore, have yet to seek positive and decisive evidence against the chapters in question.

We will conclude these observations, with two quotations from Jerome.—1. Enumerating the Evangelists, he says, “The first is Matthew the publican, surnamed Levi, who wrote his gospel in Judea, in the Hebrew language, chiefly for the sake of the Jews, that believed in Jesus, and *did not join the shadows of the law with the truth of the gospel.*”‡ 2. “Matthew, called also Levi, first of all wrote a gospel in Judea, in the Hebrew language, and in Hebrew letters, for the sake of those of the circumcision who believed. Moreover, the very Hebrew (gospel) is kept in the library at Cæsarea, which was collected with great care by the martyr Pamphilus; and with the leave of the Nazarenes who live

* Epis. ad Aug. † Let. to Dr. Horsey, p. 15. ‡ Prol. in Comment. super Matt. T. iv. init.

at Berœa in Syria, and *use that volume*, I transcribed a copy. It is observable, that whenever this evangelist, in his own person, or in the person of our Saviour, quotes any passages of the ancient scripture, he does not follow the version of the SEVENTY, but the Hebrew original. Among which these two deserve notice: ‘*Out of Egypt have I called my Son.*’ (Matt. ii. 15.); and ‘*He shall be called a Nazarene.*’ (Matt. ii. 23.)”*

These passages, the last of which Mr. G. has cited, (Vol. II. p. 381.) but not without prudently suppressing the concluding sentences, subvert his whole hypothesis. This was an ancient copy of Matthew’s Hebrew gospel. It contained the parts objected to by the Socinians. Yet it was held by those who, in the time of Jerome, were known by the name of *Nazarcnes*, and who then used it. In addition to all this, Jerome says it was originally written for those Hebrews who did not mix the shadows of the law with the truth of the gospel.

After this laborious, but vain attempt, to prove from *external* evidence, that these chapters are spurious, Mr. G. proceeds to strengthen his argument by evidence which is *internal*. To effect this, he searches for all the *difficulties* which those chapters afford him, and adds a number still more considerable from his own fruitful imagination.

When a man has an hypothesis to serve by it, he can often find difficulties which would not have been perceived by a candid enquirer. Some of those difficulties may be real; but this is no proof that the passages in which they occur are spurious; for difficulties may be met with in any piece of ancient history, and actually occur in other parts of the sacred writings, which still are allowed to be both authentic and genuine. Others of them may be accounted for from the mistakes of transcribers without in the least invalidating the scope of the narrative. Let us hear, however, what are Mr. G.’s difficulties.

I. He considers the two first chapters of Matthew’s gospel.

1. On the genealogy he observes, “it is the genealogy of Joseph, not of Mary.”†

* De Vir. Illus. cap. III.

+ Vol. II. p. 390.

The Jews would not have been satisfied that their Messiah was of the house of David, had not the genealogy of Joseph, his reputed Father, been traced to that source. Hence Luke, when he relates the miraculous conception, before he had given the genealogy, says, “the angel Gabriel was sent to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David :”* and Matthew relates that “the angel of Lord appeared unto him, saying, Joseph, thou son of David.”† It appears that the writers of the *miraculous history*, whoever they were, concerned themselves to point out the descent of Joseph, rather than of Mary. This was perfectly agreeable to the Jewish custom. According to Eusebius, “Genealogies were reckoned among the Israelites, either according to *nature*, or to *law*. According to *law*, as when another took his brother’s wife to raise up seed unto him. And this method of reckoning genealogies which is taken from the law, could not be more significantly or properly expressed, than by the words of Luke ; ‘being *ωστε οὐρανός*, as is reckoned by *law*, the son of Joseph.’”‡ —It is equally remarkable concerning Matthew, that while he gives the genealogy of Joseph, he changes his terms at the end, and says, not, as in every other part of it, “Joseph *begat* Jesus,” but “Joseph was the husband of Mary, εξ οὗ, of whom [singular] was born Jesus.”

2. “Matthew says there were *fourteen* generations from the captivity to Jesus : whereas, according to the account itself, there were only *thirteen*.”||

What then ? Mr. G. grants that “the genealogy was found in several copies of the gospel of Matthew used by the Jewish Christians :” § therefore it is not spurious. But no matter : a wound here may answer a good Socinian purpose, by affecting the verses which follow. Griesbach, however, gives authorities for many manuscripts which read Jehoiachim between Josias and Jechonias, according to 1 Chron. iii. 14—16.—This will make *fourteen* generations.

3. “The 19th verse assigns the reason for Joseph’s conduct in putting her (his espoused wife) away *privily*,

* Luke i. 26, 27.

† Matt. i. 20.

‡ Eccl. Hist. Lib. I. cap. 7.

|| Vol. II. p. 390.

§ Vol. II. p. 329.

that he was a *just man*." Against this, it appears, there are two objections. (1.) That "it was not in the power of Joseph to put her away *privily*, after a contract of marriage." (2.) That "the reason here given for Joseph's intention, viz. that he was a *just man*, is a reflection upon the justice of the Deity for the laws delivered to the Jews."*

(1.) Mr. G. should have pointed out the law which prohibited a *private* divorce before cohabitation. It is certain that Deut. xxii. 13. does not refer to such a case; and that Deut. xxiv. speaks of the wife's *having been in the husband's house*, and says nothing of a *public* divorce.

(2.) It is equally clear that Deut. xxii. 13—21. is a law made for the benefit of the husband, and that it does not require him to exhibit a public complaint, but merely prescribes how the matter was to be decided in case he did complain.—But Joseph may have had good reason for not arraigning his wife; because though the cause to which she may be supposed to attribute her situation, was not satisfactory to him, it might be a very proper inducement to treat her with all possible lenity. No man could have acted more properly in a conjuncture so delicate.

4. Mr. G. thinks it "singular" that the true state of the case was "not communicated to Joseph by Mary, without so needless a miracle as the intervention of an angel: or if it had been communicated to him, that he did not give credit to Mary's information."†

We cannot doubt that Mary related the truth to him in her own vindication. But supposing the veracity of her story, what man, under similar circumstances, would not have been, at that period, equally incredulous?

5. He violently objects to the relief of Joseph from this agitation, by a *dream*. "There is something not quite satisfactory to the mind, [it seems] in the account of miracles performed in a dream."

(1.) It is not inconsistent with what the scriptures teach of God's manner of acting, to suppose him to interpose on particular occasions, and to make known his will to individuals, by a dream. We have instances enough in the cases of

* Vol. II. p. 391.

† Vol. II. p. 393.

Abimelech, (Gen. xx. 6.) of Jacob, (Gen. xxxi. 11.) of Joseph, (Gen. xxxvii. 5.) of Pharaoh, (Gen. xli.) and of Nebuchadnezzar. (Dan. iv.) These are a sufficient apology for all the dreams which Matthew has related.

(2.) Though the dreams of individuals, independent of other circumstances, may not be satisfactory to the world, divine dreams have always been made satisfactory to the persons for whom they were intended. If not, how is it that God said, “If there be a prophet among you, I the LORD will speak unto him in a dream?” * Nor is it impossible for the relation of such dreams to become perfectly credible by the circumstances of him that reports them; for why do we give credit to the dreams related by Moses and by Daniel?—But it answer’s Mr. G.’s purpose to confound these dreams which were granted to private individuals for private purposes, with public miracles wrought for the establishment of Christianity.

6. “It is stated that all this was done to fulfil a prophecy. The antecedent to ‘*all this*’ must be the situation of Mary, and the appearance of an angel in a dream.” †

Where the point of this observation lies, it is difficult to perceive. But a man must say something!—The words, “*All this*,” refer to the situation of Mary, and the means which were used for the preservation of her *person* and *purity*, that the prophecy might be fulfilled.

7. “The angel then assigns as a reason for his being called Jesus, that it was predicted that he should be called EMMANUEL!” ‡

When? and where? The angel said no such thing. The prophecy is cited by Matthew; not by the angel.

8. “Why did Matthew translate the Hebrew word EMMANUEL into Greek, when he wrote for Hebrews?” || Perhaps it was translated, when the translation of the whole was made, not improbably by Matthew himself. And why should not this word, while the original is retained as a proper name, be translated with the rest of the book?

* Num. xii. 6. † Vol. II. p. 393. ‡ Vol. II. p. 397. || Vol. II. p. 27.

9. “The expression ‘*first born*’ was never used among the Jews as applying to an only child.” *

But it was : or how could the Jews know that their first-born was the Lord’s according to the law, until they had a *second* child? The *first* child was the *first-born*, and was the Lord’s, whether a *second* followed or not. We are not, however, concerned in the question, whether Mary had other children.

10. “Matthew in citing the prophecy of Micah, has the words ‘art not the least;’ whereas the words of Micah are ‘though thou art little.’” †

“Some manuscripts, of very good note, among which is the *Codex Bezae*, have $\mu\nu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\chi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\epsilon\iota$, ‘Art thou not the least?’ This reconciles the Prophet and the Evangelist, without farther trouble.” ‡

11. “The variation will be observed in the insertion of the word ‘governor,’ which is not in Micah, for ‘he.’” ||

Suppose that Matthew wrote, according to Micah, “he shall come forth unto me to be *ruler* in Israel.” § *He* that *rules*, is a *governor* who rules ; and therefore our copy is a very good translation.

12. “But it is most remarkable in the change of the word ‘Ephratah,’ for ‘Judah,’ or ‘Judea,’ as contained in many Greek copies of the New Testament.” ¶

Why then does Mr. G. “suppose this change to be made by Matthew,” unless *all* the Greek copies had this change? But the change itself is of no importance when we consider that Matthew wrote for the whole world.

13. Throughout his whole comment on Matt. ii., Mr. G. without a shadow of proof, assumes that the Magi who came from the East, were judicial astrologers: or, as he calls them, “conjurors.” ** This hypothesis affords much scope to his ingenuity. As many of his observations are founded on this theory, it requires some proof. “The Jews believed that there were prophets in the kingdom of Saba, and Arabia, who were of the posterity of Abraham by Keturah:

* Vol. II. p. 398. † Vol. II. p. 408. ‡ Dr. A. Clarke, in loc.

|| Vol. II. p. 408. § Mic. v. 2. ¶ Vol. II. p. 409.

** Vol. II. p. 414.

and that they taught in the name of God, what they had received in tradition from the mouth of Abraham. That many Jews were mixed with this people, there is little doubt ; and that these eastern Magi may have been originally of that class, there is room to believe. These, knowing the promise of the Messiah, were now probably, like other believing Jews, waiting for the consolation of Israel."*—This is much more probable than Mr. G.'s conjecture; but it would not have suited his purpose, which is to find, or to invent, improbabilities.

14. The flight into Egypt, and the return to Nazareth, are objected to by Mr. G. on such grounds as his prejudice, rather than his reason, has suggested. But instead of answering his cavils, the Reader must be reminded that the gospel by St. Matthew, held by the Nazarenes, and copied by Jerome, contained these two passages :—"Out of Egypt have I called my Son :"—and "He shall be called a Nazarene." (See p. 344.) As these passages stand immediately connected, the first with the return from Egypt, and the last with his coming to Nazareth, the proof that the gospel held by those Nazarenes contained those accounts, is unequivocal. Mr. G., therefore, must grant that they are not spurious.

Having replied to those objections which have any appearance of solidity, it is not necessary to follow Mr. G. through all the silly questions which, to darken the subject, he proposes : or through the arguments which he erects on difficulties of his own making. He may puzzle himself a little longer, in finding how Joseph could know the situation of Mary ; † and amuse himself with conjectures "how it could get to Matthew's knowledge, that Joseph had had a dream."‡ When he has settled these knotty questions, he will be at leisure to prosecute his inquiries into the propriety of Joseph's behaviour as related in Matt. i. 25.—Though we think him a little unreasonable, we will not intermeddle in his quarrel with Matthew, who has left Luke to inform us that Bethlehem was not the original abode of the holy family. ||—We will not interfere in the department of com-

* Dr. A. Clark, in loc. † Vol. II. p. 391. ‡ Vol. II. p. 391. || Vol. II. p. 400.

mon sense to shew him, that the Magi meant they were in the East, when they first saw the star, of which they say, “we have seen his star in the east.”*—He shall still be at liberty to speak of the *wisdom* or of the *folly*, of these Magi, in relating at Jerusalem the object of their journey. †—He shall not be beholden to us for any ingenious conjecture concerning the nature of the star which guided them, its height, its motions, the possibility or impossibility of its being seen by other persons, its evanescence or its permanence. ‡—We will not explain to him how “all Jerusalem might be thrown into commotion by news, which, if true, bade fair to sap the foundation of a hated, tyrannical government.”||—He shall still be left to imagine that tyrants (such as Herod) are *open, sincere, tender-hearted, conscientious*, and free from *jealousy*; and that *hypocrites* cannot *hope* to be *credited*. § He shall not be hindered from supposing that a *stranger* may easily be found, by those who known either his *name*, nor his *residence*. ¶ We will not vindicate the *rationality* of Herod, who commanded the wise-men, to “make diligent *search*” for the young child; ** or undertake the arduous task of teaching Mr. G. to enter into the feelings of those first *worshippers* of the *Messiah*, as exemplified in their *joy* at seeing again the star which was to guide them to THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD. ††

Should the Reader inquire why a more particular answer is not given to such objections as these, he is desired to consider: 1. That to dwell on such subjects would prove a great dearth of controversial topics: and 2. That though Mr. G. might really need a little friendly assistance in some serious difficulties, he wants only the *disposition* to vindicate Matthew against these petty cavils which are the fruit, not of critical sagacity, but of unreasonable prejudice, and which are produced by misconstruing the text, and raising objections against *his own comment*.

II. Mr. G. proceeds next to consider the two “miraculous chapters” of Luke’s gospel. Those of Matthew “ap-

* Vol. II. p. 404.

† Vol. II. p. 404

‡ Vol. II. p. 405, 406.

|| Vol. II. p. 407.

§ Vol. II. p. 411—414.

¶ Vol. II. p. 414.

** Vol. II. p. 413.

†† Vol. II. p. 415.

pear to him *indisputably* spurious.”* But we have ventured to *dispute* it. “ Those ascribed to Luke [he acknowledges] have not equally strong evidence against them.”† If there is *any* evidence against them, it will appear in the examination of his Lecture. In the mean time, the Reader will remember that we have found strong and satisfactory evidence in their favour.

Having stated that Luke’s gospel was written in Greece, for the Gentile converts,‡ he “ supposes for argument’s sake,” || [i. e. for want of argument,] that at first it did not contain the two chapters which relate to our Lord’s nativity, and that they were *early* foisted in from some spurious gospel, and circulated in this form till the adulterated gospel was universally received. §

This “ supposition for *argument’s sake*” cannot for *truth’s* sake be admitted.

1. Mr. G. supposes that this story of the miraculous conception and nativity, made a part of one of those spurious gospels which were written before the genuine gospel of Luke. According to him, therefore, a report of the miraculous conception was extensively spread among the Gentile converts, in the days of the Apostles. If this report had been false, the Apostles, whose business it was, as Mr. G. contends, to rectify every mischievous error, and preserve the purity of the gospel, would have pointedly refuted it in their writings; and their not refuting it, is satisfactory proof that it was true. This argument is still more conclusive, on the supposition that the story was so early ascribed to Luke.

2. If Mr. G. suppose that this story was not added to the genuine gospel in the time of the Apostles, it is then to be remembered, that while John lived, the genuine gospel of Luke was circulated among all the Gentiles. Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia, says, that before John wrote his gospel, those of the three other Evangelists “ were spread over all the world, and were received by all the faithful in general with great regard.”¶ When so many copies of the genuine gospel were in the hands of the Gentile converts, it would

* Vol. II. p. 495. † Vol. II. p. 494. ‡ Vol. II. p. 431. || Vol. II. p. 432.

§ Vol. II. p. 431—433. ¶ Lard. Cred. Vol. IX. p. 103.

become extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to interpolate them all, and to introduce universally a doctrine so contrary to what had been received, without raising violent opposition, and causing a commotion the report of which must have reached even to the present times.

3. The Marcionites held a mutilated gospel attributed to Luke, which did not contain the "miraculous story." Mr. G. enlists them under the banner of Socinus, because on this point they agree with himself: and he is welcome to associate them with his party. Tertullian maintains against them the genuineness of those gospels, which teach that "*Christ was born of a virgin:*"* and of that of Luke in particular. "If it be certain, (he says) that is most genuine which is most ancient, that most ancient which is from the beginning, and that from the beginning which is from the Apostles; in like manner it will be also certain, that has been delivered from the Apostles which is held sacred in the churches of the Apostles. Let us then see, what milk the Corinthians received from Paul; to what rule the Galatians were reduced; what the Philippians read; what the Thessalonians, the Ephesians, and likewise what the Romans recite, who are near to us, with whom both Peter and Paul left the gospel sealed with their blood.—I say then, that with them, but not with them only which are apostolical, but with all who have fellowship with them in the same faith, is that "gospel of Luke received from its first publication, which we so zealously maintain." †

Mr. G. already feels the weight of this argument, and, to evade it as well as he can, he supposes all the Gentile converts to have been perverted, and all the genuine gospels to have been interpolated: so that his faithful allies the Ebionites "had no alternative but to receive or reject the whole."‡ Thus all the Greek gospels were lost to what he would call the Christian churches! *Credat Judæus Apelles!* —He then feelingly complains, that "of the conduct of the Hebrew Christians, (the Ebionites) all the accounts have come down to us *through the medium of opponents.*" || Alas!

* Adv. Marcion, lib. IV. cap. 2.

‡ Vol. II. p. 135.

† Adv. Marcion, lib. IV. cap. 5.

|| Vol. II. p. 135.

There were no *Christians* in the first ages but the Ebionites: and of them, divine providence has not permitted one to give us a faithful account of the rest! So Mr. G. confesses that he can place no dependance on ecclesiastical history, and that he is perfectly in the dark. But no matter;

For ev'n though vanquish'd, he can argue still!

As he finds a deficiency of *external* evidence against the authenticity of Luke's two first chapters, he labours to find, or to make, some evidence from the chapters themselves.

1. He opens his attack, by noticing a supposed inconsistency between the Author's introduction, and the two first chapters. He takes for granted that in his introduction, "Luke could intend only to relate the *public* life of Jesus;"* whereas the two first chapters refer to his birth and education.

If the Reader consult the first four verses of the Evangelist, he will find that not one word is said of Luke's design to write only the *public* life of Jesus. Mention is there made of "many who had taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which were most surely believed, even as they delivered them who were eye-witnesses;" but Luke says, "it seemed good to him also, having had perfect understanding of things from the very first, to write *in order*."—Here is nothing to distinguish, in his own purpose, between what was done *publicly*, and what took place in *private*. But if he had professed to write the *public* life of Jesus; unless he had proposed *only* that, who would find fault with him for beginning with the birth and education of the subject of his history? If a writer purpose to relate the *public* life of some great man, why is he to be condemned for beginning with the time and place of his nativity, and the circumstances of his introduction to the scene of action?

2. "It is a singular assertion of the angel, that John should be 'filled with the Holy Spirit even from his

* Vol. II. p. 439.

mother's womb.' No good can be imagined to have accrued from such a miracle." *

It *is* singular: or why should it be asserted at all? And it would be singular if a Socinian could imagine what good could accrue from it. He has no idea of the gift of the Holy Ghost, but for the performance of miracles. Untaught by the sacred writers, he never dreams that the Holy Ghost is "the Spirit of *holiness*," and that human beings do not answer the purpose of their creation, till they become "an habitation of God through the Spirit," and are "filled into the fulness of God."

3. "The promises which are made of the future kingdom of Jesus, (Luke i. 31, 32, 33.) if spiritual, imparted a degree of knowledge to Mary which she does not seem afterwards to have possessed." †

That they related to a spiritual dominion, there is no room to doubt: and that neither Mary nor the disciples understood the precise nature of that dominion, till a later period, we grant. But the ignorance of Mary, after the annunciation of the angel, is certainly as excusable as that of the disciples, after the repeated declarations and instructions which they received from Jesus Christ himself.

4. "That Elizabeth should greet Mary, as 'the Mother of her Lord,' goes on the presumption that Elizabeth knew that the child of Mary was to be the Messiah, which was not known till thirty years afterwards." ‡

This is *assuming* that Luke's account is false, in order to prove it false. Elizabeth knew that Mary's child should be the Messiah, because the angel had said, that John should "go before the Lord their God," by "the babe leaping in her womb," and by "being filled with the Holy Ghost." ||

5. "Nor does our astonishment terminate here, for Mary also seems to be fully aware what her son would be." §

But why be so *astonished*, when it is known that the angel had said?—"Blessed art thou among women:—thou shalt bring forth a son. He shall be great, and shall be

* Vol. II. p. 439. † Vol. II. p. 441. ‡ Vol. II. p. 444.

|| Luke i. 16, 17, 41.

§ Vol. II. p. 444.

called the Son of the Highest : and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.”*

6. “ He objects to “the first five verses of the second chapter.”

(1.) That “this phrase, ‘the whole world,’ is generally used to signify the whole Roman empire. Now of all the historians who have written of this period, not one has mentioned this extraordinary taxing (of the whole Roman empire) in the days of Herod the Great.”†

But what will this amount to, unless it be made to appear that Luke’s words, *πασαν τὴν οικουμένην*, are *always* “used to signify the whole Roman Empire?” Where is the *proof* of this? Mr. G. may find this same Evangelist obviously applying the same phrase to the land of Judea. “Men’s hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on *τὴν οικουμένην*, the land.” Compare Luke xxi. 21, and 26.—And this is the sense of the passage in question.

(2.) “At this period the Roman emperors do not appear to have interfered at all in the *internal* management of Judea.”‡

But Mr. G. has not made it “*appear*” that they did *not*. It’s “not appearing,” will *not prove* that Augustus did not issue this decree; for from *nothing*, nothing is to be inferred.

(3.) “Supposing that a decree of this nature was issued by Augustus, it is very improbable that each person should be compelled to go to the city or town in which he was born.”||

Are we then to condemn every thing merely on our own perverse opinion of its improbability? Mr. G. should either prove that Luke’s statement is false, or let it alone.

(4.) “Bethlehem does not appear to have been Joseph’s native place.” §

* Luke i. 28, 31—33.

† Vol. II. p. 447.

‡ Vol. II. p. 448.

|| Vol. II. p. 449.

§ Vol. II. p. 449.

It “does not appear” that it was *not*.

(5.) “There was no necessity, according to the Jewish customs, for Mary’s going.” *

If there was no necessity, “according to the Jewish customs,” there might be prudential reasons for her going with her husband: the providence of God so ordering it that Christ should be born at Bethlehem.

(6.) “Cyrenius was not made governor of Syria, till ten or twelve years after the *death of Herod*.” †

Granted. But the words of Luke, $\pi\rho\omega\tau\eta\ \eta\rho\varepsilon\mu\omega\nu\eta\omega\tau\oslash$ της Συρίας Κυρηνίου, may be translated, “BEFORE Cyrenius was governor of Syria.” The word $\pi\rho\omega\tau\oslash$ is used in this sense, in John i. 30.: $\pi\rho\omega\tau\oslash\ \mu\omega\ \eta\omega$, “he was *before* me;” and in John xv. 18.: “the world hated me, $\pi\rho\omega\tau\oslash\ \nu\mu\omega\eta\omega$, *before* it hated you.” The sense is therefore legitimate, and renders the passage consistent with the fact alluded to. (See Dr. A. Clarke in loc.) Other solutions are given by Dr. Lardner; (Vol. I. p. 248—329.) but none of them satisfy Mr. G. And no wonder! It would not answer his purpose to be satisfied. But the credit of Luke is not to be affected by his dissatisfaction.

(7.) “But when Cyrenius was governor of Syria, which was ten or twelve years after the death of Herod, there was an enrolment from which the Jews apprehended entire slavery. This must imply that they had never before been so assessed.” ‡

Not at all. The Jews might patiently endure a *first* enrolment, because they had neither witnessed, nor conceived, the effects which it would produce. Before a second was made, their eyes might be opened, and they might be more easily excited to resist. But this, either under a first, or a second, enrolment, would depend on the zeal of some individuals. Accordingly, the very passage which Mr. G. has cited from Josephus, asserts that “Judas Gaulonites, together with one Sadducus, a pharisee, urged them to rebel, asserting that the enrolment brought upon them nothing less than *entire slavery*, and calling upon the nation

* Vol. II. p. 449.

† Vol. II. p. 450.

‡ Vol. II. p. 453.

to maintain their liberty." * This might be done as probably on the *second* as on the *first* occasion :

(8.) But we have additional " proof that this (under Cyrenius) was not only the *first*, but the *only* assessment of the kind, that Gamaliel in Acts v. 37. calls the days of Judas of Galilee, the days of the *taxing*." †

By no means : for Gamaliel might speak thus, because that *taxing* was rendered remarkable by the insurrection which it occasioned.

Here then is no proof of any error in the statement of Luke.

7. " Another error will be found in verses 41, 42. It was not 'the custom,' among the Jews, for the whole family or for both parents to go up to Jerusalem, but for males only. It is then scarcely within the limits of credibility that both Joseph and Mary went up to Jerusalem *every year*, from Nazareth, when the law required the presence of Joseph only." ‡

The words of the Evangelist do not necessarily imply that it was the custom for females to go to the feast, but that it was the custom for males to go up when they were twelve years of age. That the Mother of Jesus should go with him, is not to be wondered, when we consider the extraordinary character of the child. Nor can the distance of Nazareth from Jerusalem, be a solid objection, when it is considered that boys of twelve years, went up from *all parts* of the land of Israel. When so great a concourse of people went up to the feast, it would be unreasonable to suppose that some women did not customarily attend them, though the law did not require it.

8. Mr. G. affects to raise a number of serious objections from the wonder and astonishment which were frequently excited by new circumstances. After many extraordinary things had taken place, " when Simeon congratulated the parents of the child, we are told that Joseph and his *mother marvelled*." || They were *amazed* when they found him in the temple conversing with the Doctors. § And lastly, when

* Vol. II. p. 452.

† Vol. II. p. 453.

‡ Vol. II. p. 457.

|| Vol. II. p. 456.

§ Vol. II. p. 457.

he said, ‘ How is it that ye sought me ? Wist ye not that I must be about my father’s business ? ’ to perfect his argument, as if Luke had again spoken of their *wonder*, Mr. G. represents them as “ at the acmé of amazement.” *

To pass by this last mistake, we put it to any man of sense and candour, whether it be not perfectly probable that new circumstances should excite new wonder. Who will say that the amazement of the parents has not since been raised to a much higher pitch, and that it will cease before Jesus shall come in the clouds of heaven, when he shall be “ *admired* in all them that believe ? ”

We now find ourselves again in the midst of objections which neither require nor deserve a reply. We are not concerned to prove the reasonableness of Mary’s agitation on the salutation which she received, † of Elizabeth’s retirement after her conception, ‡ of Mary’s leaving Elizabeth when she had about fulfilled her time, || of the fear which came on the neighbours of Zacharias after the birth and circumcision of John ; § or of Mary’s bringing forth at Bethlehem, under great inconvenience, when her cousin Elizabeth lived only a few miles distant. ¶¶ Mr. G. shall be left to invent a more delicate speech for Mary, or to be shocked at that which is recorded, **—to quarrel with Luke for not having informed him when Joseph and Mary were married, ††—for not making further mention of Elizabeth, or of any additional visits which Mary paid to her, ‡‡—to determine the nature of what Elizabeth felt on the salutation of Mary, and the manner in which it came to be known, ¶¶—to shew cause why Bethlehem was crowded, §§—and to convince himself and his “ learned [Socinian] commentators ” that a manger is not a cave. ¶¶—On such topics, the Bookseller will best appreciate his observations.

III. Mr. G.’s “ next point is to compare the accounts in the two chapters *supposed* to have been written by Matthew, with the two ascribed to Luke.” We haste to attend him.

* Vol. II. p. 458.

† Vol. II. p. 411.

‡ Vol. II. p. 449.

|| Vol. II. p. 443, 445.

§ Vol. II. p. 445.

¶ Vol. II. p. 455.

** Vol. II. p. 442.

†† Vol. II. p. 443.

‡‡ Vol. II. p. 454.

¶¶ Vol. II. p. 413.

§§ Vol. II. p. 455.

¶¶ Vol. II. p. 455.

1. "The accounts are so totally different that no one event is found related by both."*

That the two Evangelists dwell on different circumstances connected with the birth of Jesus, is granted. But this makes nothing against the truth of their history. Luke relates what Matthew had omitted.

2. "According to Matthew, the Magi are the first persons who bring the important tidings to Jerusalem."†

We will wait till Mr. G. have shewn where Matthew has said, that no news of the birth of Christ had reached Jerusalem before the Magi came thither. When this is done, we will attend to the argument founded on it.

3. "According to Matthew's account, Bethlehem appears to have been the usual residence of Joseph and Mary."‡

It may *appear* to Mr. G.; but to any person who cannot see with *his* eyes, it will not appear that Matthew has said any thing about their usual residence.

4. "According to Matthew, the Magi are directed to a *house* as the residence of Jesus. From Luke we can collect only that he was laid in a manger."||

But does Mr. G. "collect" from Luke that that manger was in the open air?

5. "According to Matthew, Joseph and Mary must have stayed at Bethlehem a considerable time, when they began their journey to Egypt. Luke states that after the performance of all the ceremonies according to the law, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth."§

The words of Luke do not necessarily imply that they went *immediately* from Jerusalem to Nazareth. It is therefore perfectly easy and natural to suppose that they went first to Bethlehem, where they received the visit of the Magi; and that they then took their journey into Egypt, from whence they returned to Nazareth. This gives room for all that is related by either of the Evangelists.

* Vol. II. p. 459. † Vol. II. p. 460. ‡ Vol. II. p. 461.

|| Vol. II. p. 461. § Vol. II. p. 462.

6. "Luke makes the parents go up from Nazareth to Jerusalem every year. Matthew records their taking a long journey into Egypt."*

Mr. G. cannot prove from Matthew that the journey to Egypt took up a whole year. Nor does Luke say, how long they had strictly attended to the custom of annually going up to Jerusalem. His words may be true, as referring to the time of which he speaks, even if the parents, while they were in Egypt, had *once* omitted to visit Jerusalem.

IV. Mr. G. in the last place examines the evidence deducible from other parts of evangelical history.

1. "The first thing that strikes him is, that neither Matthew nor Luke mentions the miraculous conception, throughout the whole remainder of their gospels."†

The frequent recurrence of this mode of reasoning, and the gravity with which it is exhibited, excite a desire to know what are the principles on which it is founded. Must the account which the historian gives of the birth of his subject in the beginning of his narrative, be deemed spurious, because, after he has finished that part of it, he does not afterwards advert to it?

2. "In the gospels of Mark and John, these miraculous events are altogether omitted."‡

It is much more just to argue that if Matthew and Luke had, in their genuine works, given no account of the birth of Jesus, Mark or John would have supplied the deficiency; than, that it was necessary for Mark or John, to repeat what was already recorded. This observation will have the more weight, when it is considered that an account of the birth of Jesus was necessary as a record of the fulfilment of many important prophecies; and that John wrote his gospel as a supplement to the rest. The silence of Mark and John, therefore, if it prove any thing, proves that the accounts given by Matthew and Luke are genuine.||

* Vol. II. p. 462. † Vol. II. p. 463. ‡ Vol. II. p. 463.

|| Mr. G. supposes Mark's gospel to be an abridgment of Matthew's, and then assigns a curious reason for Mark's silence on this subject: viz. that Matthew's gospel did not contain those chapters. Vol. II. p. 464. So an *abridgment* proves that the *original* contained nothing but what is found in the abridgment. Taking the word in its *vulgar* sense, we do not, however, allow that Mark abridged Matthew.

But allowing Mr. G.'s mode of reasoning to be good, it will follow that Jesus Christ was not born at all, because John or Mark makes no mention of his birth.

3. "The commencement of the chapter which, in our received version, stands as the third of the Evangelist Matthew, is exceedingly unnatural in its connection with the two preceding chapters."^{*}

Such is the power of prejudice! The third chapter begins with, "*In those days* came John the Baptist, *preaching*." Now let the Reader judge whether "*those days*" are most naturally connected with the words, "and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations,"—or with the latter part of the second chapter, which speaks of Jesus, "*dwelling at Nazareth*." While Jesus dwelt at Nazareth, "*in those days* came John the Baptist, *preaching*."

4. The next objection is taken from a comparison of the dates which Luke gives in the beginning of his third chapter, with what may be gathered from Matthew. Mr. G. computes that, whereas, according to Luke, our Lord was about *thirty* years of age when John opened his ministry, according to Matthew he was then about *thirty-six* years of age.[†]

When a man has a purpose to serve by a compound, chronological calculation, he can take many advantages. If there are different periods from which he may calculate, he can fix upon that which will best serve the cause he has espoused. Where only the *year* is named, he can take what *month* of it he chooses, and thereby gain several months. And when time is to be allowed for any given transaction, he can lengthen or shorten the period of it as he pleases.[‡] Thus, by various measures, all operating the same way, he makes sure of his object. But this is not the method in which a candid critic would examine the chronology of

* Vol. II. p. 465. † Vol. II. p. 466—469.

‡ Mr. G. has given us a remarkable instance of this manœuvre. He says that our Saviour must have been between *two* and *three* years of age when Herod died: it is generally *presumed* that he was *four*. Then, instead of taking that number which he grants may possibly be just, he takes that which will best prove the error of the Evangelist. Vol. II. p. 467, 468.

a writer. He would give, rather than take, every advantage.

The reign of Tiberius may be calculated from two different periods: the first, when he became a partner in the empire with Augustus; the second, when he became sole governor. Several learned chronologers are of opinion, that Luke dates the ministry of John from the former of these periods; and they are very probably in the right; for, whatever might be done in the imperial city, it was common in the provinces to date from the pro-consular reign. Now the pro-consular reign of Tiberius is supposed by some to have begun about three years before the death of Augustus, on the 28th of Aug. A. U. 764. According to this date, the 15th year of his reign began Aug. 28th A. U. 778. Supposing that John began his ministry in November following, in the same year, then, allowing that Jesus was born in September, A. U. 748, he would be about 30 years of age at the commencement of John's ministry.* Mr. G. supposes Herod to have died A. U. 750. This was two years after the birth of Christ.—It is not necessary to allow any more than about one year and a half from the birth of Christ to the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem, or more than half a year from the massacre to the death of Herod.—At this rate, Matthew and Luke agree exactly in their chronological dates.

5. “Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, alludes to his ‘former treatise,’ and mentions the nature and object of that treatise, namely, to relate ‘all that Jesus began *both to do and to teach.*’ If he had been the author of the two chapters ascribed to him, it would have been easy and natural to have mentioned these as included.”†

Apply this to the genealogy, or, to the ministry of John, both of which are recorded in the chapters which Mr. G. thinks to be genuine, and try whether the argument be good. And yet it is as applicable in one case as in the other. The truth is, the words of Luke mean no more

* The reader may find the authorities for this computation in Dr. Lardner's Credibility of the gospel History, P. I. B. II. C. 3.

† Vol. II. p. 470.

than that he had treated of the acts of Jesus in his former work, and now he was about to write the acts of the Apostles.

6. "Luke states that all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not.—Ask yourselves whether the author who wrote the above, is the same as he who wrote the account of the shepherds, and of Anna."^{*}

Suppose the reports which were spread by the shepherds, by Anna, and add, by the Magi, to have excited an unusual expectation of the speedy appearance of the Messiah. Does it follow, that they who looked for him, knew his person? If not, they might at first imagine that John was "he that should come."

7. "If the Evangelists Matthew and Luke knew that Jesus was born at Bethlehem, would they not, sometimes at least, have denominated him Jesus of Bethlehem?"[†]

Is it clear, beyond all contradiction, that every person is denominated from the place of his *nativity*, rather than from the place of his long-continued *residence*? Had the Evangelists denominated him Jesus a *native* of Nazareth, Mr. G. might have made something of it. But he is denominated *Jesus of Nazareth*, because "he dwelt in Nazareth." Let Mr. G. produce the place where the Apostles said or allowed that *Jesus was born in Nazareth*, and we must bow to its authority.

"Then here is the passage! 'When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether the man were a Galilean; and as soon as he knew that he belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod.' Here you see an inquiry is actually made into the birth-place of Jesus, and the result of the inquiry is, that he was born at Nazareth."[‡]

How does it appear that the "inquiry was made into the *birth-place of Jesus?*" Is here one word about the place of his birth? And why was not the place of his abode the subject of the inquiry? Did not Jesus come under Herod's jurisdiction by being an *inhabitant* of Galilee?

* Vol. II. p. 471. † Vol. II. p. 471. ‡ Vol. II. p. 475.
A a 2

8. “ It is recorded of John that he ‘ *knew not*’ Christ. If the miraculous events recorded in the first two chapters of Matthew and Luke be true, and so great an intimacy subsisted between Mary and Elizabeth, is it probable that, for thirty years, Jesus should be unknown to John ? ”*

It is not at all improbable that two persons should be thirty years unacquainted with each other. As for the “ miraculous events” of which Mr. G. speaks, none of them had any reference to their ever being brought together : nor can Mr. G. prove from those chapters that they had had any opportunity of knowing each other.

9. “ All the Jews considered Jesus as the son of Joseph, and the Evangelists, so far from contradicting this opinion, appear to have encouraged it, and to have believed it themselves.”†

(1.) That the Jews in general believed Jesus to be the Son of Joseph, is not denied. Nor is it denied that they were never better informed during our Lord’s ministry. Until he was “ declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead,” they were not likely to believe it ; because the proofs of his being the Messiah were the only proofs that, in the nature of the thing, could be given of the miraculous conception, had it been announced to them. To have explicitly published this circumstance before, would have been only to throw a stumbling block in their way. But though the Jews thought him the Son of Joseph, neither Jesus, nor his disciples when they were well informed, ever acquiesced in that opinion, or encouraged it. The truth is, that they seem to have always evaded it. Mr. G. has attempted to prove the contrary : but without success. “ When he was come into his own country, his countrymen said, Is not this the carpenter’s son ? and they were offended in him. But Jesus said unto them, A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house.”‡—Was this either an acknowledgment, or a denial, that he was the carpenter’s son ? In the next passage which Mr. G. quotes, his being the son of Joseph is no part of the question. They said, “ Is not this the car-

* Vol. II. p. 447. † Vol. II. p. 447. ‡ Mat. xiii. 54—57.

penter, the son of Mary?"* The next passage runs thus : "And they said, Is not this Joseph's son? and he said unto them, Ye will surely say, Physician heal thyself. And he said, verily, I say unto you, no prophet is accepted in his own country."† "This (says Mr. G.) is *most assuredly an acknowledgment* by Jesus himself that he was the son of Joseph."‡ But who beside Mr. G. can see it? It is an acknowledgment that Nazareth was his own country. Mr. G. thinks, however, that the Evangelists believed it because they have recorded these things without any note of censure.|| Just as well might he argue that they believed Jesus to be a blasphemer!

(2.) The correlative terms, father and son, are sometimes used properly, and sometimes improperly. If this were not the case, how could "the author of the two miraculous chapters generally ascribed to Luke," after he had recorded the miraculous conception, put into the mouth of Mary those words, "Thy Father and I have sought thee sorrowing?" and how could Jesus "call God his Father, and be the proper son of Joseph?" Joseph might be called "the father of Jesus," as being a kind of *father-in-law*, and the term might be so used with perfect innocence, when it did not involve the question of procreation. But Joseph is never styled his proper father; whereas, when "the Jews sought to kill him, because he said that God was *ἰδιος πατέρες*, 'his proper father,'"§ so far from retracting, he proceeded to vindicate, the terms which he had used: and Paul styles him "*τὸν ἴδιον νιον*, the *proper Son of God.*"¶

10. "When Philip found Nathanael, he said unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth the *Son of Joseph!*"**

At this time, whether the story of the miraculous conception be true or false, Nathanael knew nothing of it. He had but just become acquainted with the person of Christ, and distinguished him by the appellation by which he was commonly known. This therefore proves nothing!

* Mark vi. 3. † Luke iv. 22—24. ‡ Vol. II. p. 472.|| || Vol. II. p. 479.

§ John v. 18.

¶ Rom. viii. 32.

** Vol. II. p. 479.

11. "If Jesus were not the son of Joseph, what propriety or consistency can there be in that appellation, 'The Son of Man?' Would the same appellation be given to Adam?*?"

What a blunder! Was Adam born of a woman? But waving this, when Mr. G. has told us with what propriety Jesus was called "the Son of David," he will be able to assign a reason for his calling himself "the Son of *Man*," without supposing that Joseph was his *proper* father,

12. "We read in Mark that his friends said, 'He is beside himself.' How inconsistent this charge of supposed *insanity* is with the miraculous chapters, a few moments' consideration will enable any one to decide."†

One moment is quite enough; for the charge is as consistent with those chapters, as with the miracles at his baptism, or the miracles which the inhabitants of Nazareth had "heard were done in Capernaum."‡ He that can reconcile it in the one case, will have overcome all the difficulty of the other.

13. "Luke is positive that he was the son of Joseph, really being, as he was supposed, the son of Joseph."||

We may omit the passage already quoted from Eusebius, (p. 343.) for Mr. G. has answered his own argument. "It is rather remarkable, (says he) that Grotius, when vindicating the two genealogies, although he says, Jesus was not the son of Joseph, states that—Luke, by the term εὐομένω, meant (not the *natural*, but) the *legal* descent. In plain words Joseph was not the *natural*, but the *legal* father, the father-in-law, of Jesus.

In concluding this important subject, it is but candid to observe, that Mr. G. has taken immense pains to render the miraculous conception doubtful. If the question is to be decided by the *number* of his arguments, the victory will be indisputably his. But if a weak cause can need to be betrayed by the imprudent officiousness of its apologist, Mr. G. is the man to decide its fate. A few of his arguments have apparent force, and needed to be fairly examined and refuted: but the majority of them are the most

* Vol. II. p. 480. † Vol. II. p. 480. ‡ Luke iv. 23. || Vol. II. p. 481.

unworthy of a man of sense that can be imagined ; and precisely such as Mr. Paine has used against the whole Christian system. It is not, however, the business of a polemic to ridicule, but to answer, the arguments of his opponent. We have answered far more than were deserving of notice, and after a close examination of them all, we see the doctrine in question stand unshaken as a temple, the main pillars of which have not been even touched. It is not, however, Mr. G.'s fault, that he has not succeeded in robbing the Redeemer of his peculiar glory, and in degrading him to a level with many of the sinners for whose salvation he came into the world.

CHAPTER XV.

Of the Ordinary Influence of the Holy Spirit.

IT is an opinion of the Socinians, which has been frequently repeated by Mr. G., that the Holy Spirit is no other than the energy or operation of God. We think it right, for reasons already assigned, (chap. 6.) to hold a language which appears to us to agree more exactly with the general tenor of scripture, and to conceive of the Holy Spirit as of God energizing or operating on his creatures, in their formation, sustenance, or improvement. But whether, on this occasion, we adopt our own language or that of our antagonist, we are warranted to say, It is not possible that any creature should be without a divine influence. For whether the Divine Spirit be the Divine energy or operation, or God operating on his creatures,—if that Spirit be (as the scriptures assert) every where present, God is every where operating upon his creatures.

1. The Spirit of God operated on all the creatures at their creation. (1.) On things inanimate. “The Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters.”*—By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens.”†—(2.) On things animate, and on man in particular. “God breathed into man the breath [Spirit] of life, and he became a living soul.”‡—The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.”||

2. The same Spirit still operates on all nature, for the support of the creatures of his power. (1.) On all the vegetable world. “Thou sendest forth thy Spirit; they are created: thou renewest the face of the earth.”§—(2.)

* Gen. i. 2.

† Job. xxvi. 13.

‡ Gen. ii. 7.

|| Job xxxiii. 4.

§ Psalm cix. 30.

On all the animal world. “If he gather unto himself his Spirit all flesh shall perish together.”*—(3.) And on man in particular: “For in him we live and move and have our being.”†

If the Spirit of God be the principal, immediate Author of every thing in the natural world, we may justly expect to find him a principal agent in the spiritual and moral world. Whether man be considered as an intelligent being, it is God that “teacheth him knowledge.”—“There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.”‡ Or whether he be considered as a moral agent, it is but just in him to acknowledge, “Thou, Lord, hast wrought all our works in us.”|| God poured out his Spirit of old upon the house of Israel.”§—He “gave his good Spirit to instruct them.”¶—His “Spirit strove with” them.**—He “upheld” them by his “free Spirit.”†† Some of them prayed him “not to take from them his holy Spirit.”†††—And others of them “rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit.”††† But the plenitude of the Spirit was reserved for the latter days, and to do honour to the immediate reign of Messiah, who should “baptize” his followers “with the Holy Ghost and with fire.”§§ In this enlarged sense, “the Holy Ghost was not (previously) given, because that Jesus was not then glorified.”¶¶¶ But when he “ascended up on high, he led captivity captive and received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.”***

When the great Head of the Church sent forth his Apostles to set up and establish the new dispensation, and to christianize the world, he fitted them for the vast undertaking by endowing them with supernatural wisdom, and miraculous power. That they might speak the truth of God, “not in words which human wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth,” the Spirit of truth was given to them to guide them into all truth. And to cor-

* Job xxxiv. 14, 15.

|| Isa. xxvi. 12.

** Gen. vi. 3.

||| Isa. lxiii. 10.

† Acts xvii. 28.

§ Ezek. xxxix. 29.

++ Psalm li. 12.

§§ Luke iii. 16.

*** Psalm. lxviii. 12.

‡ Job xxxii. 8.

¶ Neh. ix. 20.

¶¶ Psalm li. 11.

¶¶¶ John vii. 39.

roborate their testimony, they were enabled, in the name of the Lord Jesus, to work the most astonishing miracles. They "received power from on high, when that the Holy Ghost was come upon them, and became witnesses" of their Lord. The "*great salvation*, which at first began to be spoken by the Lord, was thus confirmed by them that heard him: God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miraeles, and gifts of the *Holy Ghost*, according to his own will."*

This extraordinary inspiration, and these miraeulous powers, were conferred on the first messengers of Christ for general purposes. The design of them was to enable the Apostles and their Helpers to spread and to establish Christianity among both Jews and Gentiles. The use of them was for the conviction of unbelievers, and the edification of the churh. (See 1 Cor. xiv. 4, 24.) But are these general purposes, the only purposes for which the Holy Ghost has been either promised or imparted? Is not the influence of the *Spirit of God* necessary to individuals for their own personal salvation? and is it not promised, and has it not been imparted, with that design?—Without any hesitation, we answer, Yes.

When Mr. G. has occasion to produce any of those passages which relate to this subjeet, he has frequently hinted, that they relate to the miraculous powers conferred on the Apostles and the primitive Ministers of the Christian Church.—As it would not be deemed fair to take occasion from those hints to examine this subjeet, without having produced some of them, the Reader is presented with the following specimens.

"It will, perhaps, be asserted, that we do not believe in the Holy Spirit, to which Jesus and his Apostles so frequently laid claim."†

"It was the energy, the power, the Spirit of God imparted to Jesus Christ and his Apostles, *manifested* by their performance of *miracles*."‡

Speaking of the command of our Lord to his Apostles to "baptize in the name of the Father, and the Son, and

* Heb. ii. 3, 4.

† Vol. I. p. 111.

‡ Vol. I. p. 112.

the Holy Spirit," he says, "The Holy Spirit, or divine energy, which was exhibited in *miracles*, is distinguished from the Son, as not being his own naturally inherent power, nor resident in *him alone*, but likewise *communicated* to the *Apostles*."^{*}

"Thus they (the writers of the New Testament) will be found to have used the term Holy Spirit, sometimes as the *cause*, viz. the energy, power, or breathing of God himself,—sometimes as the *effect*, viz. the power they possessed of working *miracles* in consequence of this energy or breathing of the Deity. These significations will be found consistently to explain all the passages relating to the Holy Spirit."[†]

"This Holy Ghost, this *Comforter*—he now declares he will send to them, and then states it to be, that they were to be 'endued with *power from on high*.' This *power*, this *Comforter*, this Holy Spirit did descend from on high to dwell with the *Apostles*, and thus the promises of God and of Jesus Christ were fulfilled."[‡]

And lastly : Speaking of the final clause of the Apostolie benediction, "the *fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all*," he represents the Apostle as wishing all the Corinthians "might enjoy a participation of the *miraculous powers*, the divine influence, which others possessed."^{||}

We have quoted thus copiously from Mr. G. that the Reader may fully understand the manner in which he precludes the expectation of any supernatural influence on the minds of mankind, in order to their salvation. From this statement, two things may be gathered: That the Socinians suppose, (1.) That the gift of the Holy Spirit was restricted to the first ages of Christianity, the age of miracles. And (2.) That it never was given but in miraculous gifts, and for extraordinary purposes. The scriptures which are to be cited on this occasion, are therefore of two classes. The first class is of those which speak *indefinitely* of the gift of the Spirit, most of which do not distinguish between the miraculous, and the saving influence; but which imply that the Holy Spirit is, or that it may be, possessed by all real Christians. The second class are of those in which the

* Vol. I. p. 132. † Vol. I. p. 163. ‡ Vol. I. p. 163. || Vol. I. p. 172.

ordinary influence of the Spirit is obviously distinguished from that which is extraordinary, and which speak of that ordinary influence in such a definite manner, as to indicate a benefit necessary for all men to make them either wise, or holy, or happy.

I. Of those scriptures which speak of the influence of the Holy Spirit, in such a manner as implies that it is, or that it may be, enjoyed by all real Christians.

It is not, perhaps, very easy to ascertain to what extent the miraculous gifts were, in the Apostolic age, given to Christian believers; but it is perfectly clear that they were *not universal*. That many real Christians did not possess them, is obvious from the language of St. Paul to the Church which was at Corinth. “God, (said he,) hath set *some* in the church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles; then, gifts of healing, helps in governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? *Are all workers of miracles?* *Have all the gifts of healing?* *Do all speak with tongues?* *Do all interpret?*”* But if all real Christians did not enjoy these miraculous gifts, and yet it should appear that they did enjoy, or were called to enjoy, the influence of the Spirit, it will follow that there is an influence of the Spirit which is *not miraculous*: and that that influence is the common privilege of all real Christians.

I. In the following scriptures, it is obvious, that the Holy Spirit is promised to *all real Christians*.

(1.) “And it shall come to pass, that *I will pour out my Spirit upon ALL FLESH*; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the *servants* and upon the *handmaids* in those days will I *pour out my Spirit*.”†—It is true, this passage speaks of the extraordinary and miraculous effusion of the Spirit, and that Peter applied it to the *spiritual gifts* which were bestowed on the day of Pentecost. Acts ii. 17, 18. But it is equally true, that the prophet speaks also of the universal effusion of the ordinary influence of the Spirit. It is to the sons and

* 1 Cor. xii. 28—30.

† Joel ii. 28, 29.

daughters of Israel, he promises that *some* (not *all*) of them should prophesy, dream dreams, and see visions ; but he promises the effusion of the Spirit to *all flesh*,—to Gentiles as well as Jews, and to the meanest as well as to the greatest : —to the servants, and to the handmaids.

(2.) “ Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized, *every one of you*, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins : and *ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to *all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*”*—Here the Apostle has explained the extent of the preceding promise, which he had taken for his text. According to him, this inestimable gift is imparted to all who repent and are baptized in the name of Christ for [expecting through him] the forgiveness of sins. And this he asserts, not only of the Jews and their children, but of “ all that are afar off,” the Gentiles also : not only of that generation, but of all succeeding generations, even “ as many as the Lord our God shall call.”

(3.) “ In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, *If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.* But this he spake of the Spirit, which *they that believe on him* should receive.”†—What our Lord has here said of *living water*, the Evangelist has explained as meaning “ the gift of the Spirit.” This Spirit our Lord has most positively promised shall be received by *all who believe on him* ; and he has invited, indiscriminately, *all who thirst for it*, thus to come and receive it. Precisely of the same character, in the latter respect, is that remarkable passage : “ *Let him that is athirst, come, and whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.*”‡

(4.) “ If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, *how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?*”|| Again : “ If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith unto thee, Give me to drink : thou wouldest have asked of

* Acts ii. 35, 39. † John vii. 37—38. ‡ Rev. xxii. 17. || Luke xi. 13.

him, and he would have given thee *living water*.”*—We have just seen, in the preceding passage, that by *living water* is meant “the Holy Spirit.”—In these two scriptures we are assured that the Holy Spirit is *given* to them that *ask* it; and the argument in both is such as to warrant the application of the promise to *all* that *ask* it. In the former, our Lord places the promise on the ground of parental affection, and, therefore, intends to give this assurance to all in every place and age; for God is the Father of all. In the latter, our Lord argues from his own character as the Messiah, who is *anointed* with the Holy Ghost without measure; and while he takes for granted, that when that character is properly known and acknowledged, the living water will be asked, he also assures us that it shall be given.

2. The following scriptures prove that the Holy Spirit was actually given to private Christians.

(1.) “What! know ye not that your body is the temple of the *Holy Ghost which is in you*, which ye have of God?”†—Here the Apostle addresses himself to all the members of the Corinthian church individually, as having received the Holy Spirit from God, and as being his habitation.

(2.) “For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we *all* baptized into one body whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.”‡—Here, not merely the Corinthian church, but *the church universal*, including both Jews and Gentiles, and all the individuals of which it is composed, whether bond or free, are positively said to be partakers of the Spirit of God.

(3.) “This only would I learn of you, *Received ye the Spirit* by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?—He therefore, that *ministereth to you the Spirit*, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law or by

* John iv. 10.

† 1 Cor. vi. 19.

‡ 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13.

the hearing of faith?"* Here the Apostle speaks of the Galatians as having "received the Spirit," and makes an obvious distinction between themselves as *private Christians*, and those Apostles who had ministered unto them the Spirit, and had wrought miracles among them. And to this reception of the Spirit he alludes, as having been *universal*, by supposing their defection from the liberty of the gospel, to be, in every case, a submission to a principle opposed to the Spirit: "Having begun in the *Spirit*, are ye now made perfect by *the flesh*?"

(4.) "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling."†—Here the individual members of the Ephesian church are supposed to be the members of an universal church which is inhabited by *one Spirit*; and each one is supposed individually to participate that *one Spirit*, as the members of one body are individually actuated by one living principle, and as they were individually called by one gospel, to the hope of one glorious inheritance.

(5.) "For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance; and ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost."‡—Thus the church at Thessalonica also received the Holy Ghost. The latter part of the passage is added, in proof that what they received was the *ordinary* influence.

3. The following passages shew that the persons who are addressed indiscriminately, had experienced, or did at the time enjoy, the divine influence.

(1.) "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye."||—So the Holy Ghost had exerted his energy on the minds of these disobedient Jews, or they could not have resisted him.

(2.) "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."§—The latter part

* Gal. iii. 2—5. † Eph. iv. 4. ‡ 1. Thess. i. 5, 6.

|| Acts vii. 51. § Eph. iv. 30.

of this passage demonstrates that the Apostle spoke, not of the *miraculous* influence, but of the *ordinary*; and the admonition implies that the private members had *received* that influence, for otherwise they could not grieve him.

(3.) “Quench not the Spirit.”*—The Reader will remember how John the Baptist predicted that Jesus Christ should “baptize them with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” This baptism of heavenly fire the Thessalonians had received, and were in danger of *quenching* it. The allusion is to the purifying power of fire; and, therefore, the influence of the Spirit which they had received, was that which *purifies*; and was not the *miraculous*, but the *saving* influence.

(4.) “And hath done despite to the Spirit of grace.”†—This passage supposes every apostate from Christianity to have enjoyed ‘the fellowship of the Spirit,’ to which he has done despite.

4. There can be no propriety in the language of the following passages, only on the supposition that the gift of the Holy Ghost is the common privilege of all Christian believers.

(1.) “The communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.”‡—This cannot be interpreted of the miraculous powers, without supposing, in contradiction to the Apostle, that “*all* are workers of miracles.”

(2.) “Be not drunk with wine; but be ye *filled* with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord; giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.”||—This passage cannot be interpreted of the extraordinary influence of the Holy Spirit, unless we suppose it necessary to every act of religious worship, and then it is no longer extraordinary, but common.

5. The following scriptures imply, and one of them expressly asserts, that a man cannot be a Christian without receiving the Holy Spirit.

* 1 Thess v. 19. † Heb. x. 20. ‡ 2. Cor. xiii. 14. || Eph. v. 19.

(1.) "These be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit."*—It will not be objected that their not having miraculous powers is here intended; for what has that to do with their being sensual?

(2.) "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, *if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.*"†—According to these two passages, every man is *in the flesh*, or is *sensual*, who has not the Spirit of God dwelling in him; and he that is in the flesh, or sensual, cannot please God. It follows that no man can be a Christian without the Spirit; because, without it, no man can please God.

Let us now take a view of the result of this scrutiny.—We have found that the Holy Spirit was originally promised to all real Christians;—that whole Christian societies, and the Christian church at large, did actually receive it;—that they who refused to become Christians, and they who apostatized from Christianity, in so doing abused the operations of the Spirit, and that all true Christians were in danger of imitating the example of the latter;—that the apostolic exhortations and benedictions were such as imply that even the fulness of the Spirit might be enjoyed by them always;—and that no man can be a Christian without some measure of it. From these truths we argue: (1.) That since *miraculous* gifts were not possessed by every real Christian, the promises of the gospel were not fulfilled, unless the Spirit were imparted to produce effects which were *not miraculous*. But "all the promises of God are yea, and amen, in Christ Jesus;" and therefore the Spirit was poured out in his ordinary and saving influence. (2.) That several of these scriptures cannot be interpreted of *miraculous* gifts without supposing miraculous gifts to be essential to the character of a Christian. But if this could be proved, it would equally imply that the same gifts are necessary to form the Christian character now. And if it be admitted that a man may now be a real Christian though he do not possess those gifts, it will follow that a man might, in primitive times, be a

* Jude 19.

† Rom. viii. 9, 10.

Christian without them. And if a Christian might then be destitute of all miraculous gifts, and yet the Spirit of Christ was necessary to form the Christian, it follows that divine operations not miraculous were then, and for the same reason will always be, necessary. (3.) That some of these scriptures distinguish the divine influence of which they speak, from those which were miraculous. Whatever reason may be given for the effusion of miraculous powers, will not be equally a reason for the effusion of that which was not miraculous. But every reason which can be given for the effusion of blessings not miraculous, in the first ages, will, in all ages of the church militant, be equally valid. (4.) That whereas some of these scriptures argue that a man could not be a Christian in the Apostles' days without the Spirit of Christ,—the same argument is equally conclusive at the present period. (5.) That this observation is corroborated by others of these scriptures which expressly assert that in all succeeding times the Holy Ghost, as it is always necessary to produce the same effects, shall be always imparted on the same terms on which it was imparted in the days of the Apostles. (6.) That if the primitive Christian Church was intended to be a perpetual pattern in doctrine and practice, it must be equally so in its means and enjoyments. If the truths which were delivered to the members of that church, by the Apostles, had either a near or a distant relation to the gift of the Holy Ghost, and if that gift was the mean by which those truths were rendered effectual to their salvation,—the same truths cannot be of the same use to us, unless they still stand in the same relation to that gift, and are rendered effectual by the same means. In like manner : if the practice of the first Christians was the result of their reception of the Holy Ghost, and had the continuance and increase of that heavenly gift, and further benefits by that gift, among its principal objects and motives,—the same practice can now be produced only by the same cause, and needs still the stimulus of the same motive, or it cannot be itself the same.—This subject, however, will be much better illustrated from the considerations which follow.

II. The second class of scriptures to which we refer, is of those in which the *ordinary* influence of the Spirit is obviously distinguished from the *extraordinary*; and which speak of the ordinary influence in such a definite manner, as to indicate a benefit which is necessary for all men, to make them either wise, or holy, or happy.

If ignorance were truly the mother of devotion, if religion consisted, as some seem to suppose, in morality without piety, or in the form of Godliness without the power, in a *regular* enjoyment of the creatures, and not in the enjoyment of God, perhaps it might be possessed and practised without any illumination, assistance, encouragement, or consolation from above. But if true religion require that we know the God whom we worship, if piety be the soul of all genuine morality, and the essence of religion, if the power as well as the form be necessary to true godliness, and if God be the proper portion of his people,—no man can be a truly good man like Barnabas, only in proportion as, like him, he is “full of the Holy Ghost.”*

1. According to the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, a divine and supernatural *illumination* is absolutely necessary to our proper knowledge of divine and saving truth.

Not that it is necessary for every man, like the Prophets and Apostles, to receive the truth by an immediate revelation from heaven. “Those Holy men of God spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”† “All (their) scriptures were given by inspiration of God.”‡ But “the vision and the prophecy are now sealed.”|| The Christian Church, and every individual member of it, are now to be “built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets [only, where] Jesus Christ is the chief cornerstone.”§ The book of revelation is now amply sufficient for every purpose both of faith and practice, and from thence “the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work.”¶ No man, therefore, whether in a public or a private station, has any scriptural right to expect that the same truths shall be made known unto

* Acts xi. 24.

† 2 Pet. i. 21.

‡ 2 Tim. iii. 16.

|| Dan. vii. 24.

§ Eph. iii. 20.

¶ 2 Tim. iii. 17.

him in the same manner, much less that any divine knowledge will be communicated to him in addition to that which is given in the sacred code. Even Apollos, while immediately employed in the work of the ministry, had no knowledge of divine things but what he had received from the "scriptures," and from the instructions "in the way of the Lord which he had heard." Though he was "fervent in the Spirit," and "spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord," he knew "only the baptism of John" in which he had been instructed, until "Aquila and Priscilla took him unto them and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly."* This example may serve to show the arrogance of those who pretend to new revelations, and the folly of those who pay any serious attention to them.—It was necessary to make this statement for the prevention of any misconception or misrepresentation of what we have to advance. For the same reason, we shall endeavour to avoid the use of the word *inspiration*: not because there would be any great impropriety in the use of it; but because we have already applied it, with the authority of Peter, to the extraordinary communications which were received by the Prophets and the Apostles.

"But if the sacred Scriptures be sufficient for the instruction of mankind, what need can there be of a divine illumination?"—We answer.

(1.) It is in vain that visible things are laid before a man who is perfectly blind. Yet this is precisely the natural state of the human mind. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God [the things revealed by the Spirit of God in the scriptures:] for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."† This spiritual discernment is what we want: the faculty for discerning spiritual things being disordered. A man may have eyes, by which, because they are diseased, he does not see. So mankind "have eyes and see not." That we may discern spiritual things, the Physician of the human mind exhorts us to "anoint our eyes with eye-salve that we may see."—The knowledge of divine

* Acts xviii. 24—26.

† 1 Cor. ii. 14.

things is therefore attributed to a gracious operation on the human mind. “We know that the Son of God is come (says St. John) and *hath given us an understanding*, that we may know him that is true.”* And God says, “I will give them a *heart* to know me.”† “He that is [thus made] spiritual, discerneth all things.”‡

(2.) In vain are objects of sight laid before the eyes of any man in perfect darkness; for nothing can render them visible but the light. “That which maketh manifest is light.” But if light be necessary to the discernment of natural things, spiritual light is equally necessary to render spiritual things discernible. As the sun is seen only by its own light, so God is known only in the light of his own Spirit. “God is light,” and “in his light (only) we see light.” The light of the sun displays to our eye-sight every other visible object in nature; and nothing but the light of God can display to our minds the spiritual things which are laid before us in the book of divine revelation. It is thus, and only thus, we *see*, like Moses, “him that is invisible.” Not that the use of our rational, or intellectual powers, is thereby superseded, any more than the use of our eyes is superseded by the light of day. But reason enlightened from above, and properly exerted, produces the “faith (which) is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen.”—This divine illumination is uniformly attributed to a divine influence. Hence the Apostle prayed in behalf of the Ephesians, that they might “receive the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the *knowledge* of him; that the eyes of their *understanding* being *enlightened*, they might know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.”||

By this twofold operation of the Spirit, and not otherwise, we are enabled properly to know the things of God. We say *properly*, because there is what is *called* knowledge, which may be attained (*perhaps*) without it. A man blind from his birth, may by oral instruction be made so far acquainted with the theory of light and colours, as even to be able to teach others; but he will have no *proper* knowledge

* 1 John v. 20.

† Jer. xxiv. 7.

‡ 1 Cor. ii. 15;

|| Eph. i. 17, 18

b b 3

of them. His knowledge is a mere artificial arrangement of words without ideas : or at least without the *proper* ideas. He can speak readily of the source, the properties, and the uses, of light : and can discourse of the comparative beauty of colours, without any conception of the true meaning of his borrowed words. His knowledge of the subject of his speculations, is, however, such as is convertible to no proper practical use. It cannot preserve him from the dangerous precipice, or guide him to his proper home.—Precisely such is all the knowledge of divine things which a man may have from any source of oral instruction, until God “open his eyes, and turn him from darkness to light.” It is a mere artificial arrangement of words without appropriate ideas ; a speculation of no more real use than the theory of light and colours to the blind. It is not that “knowledge of the only true God, and of Jesus Christ whom he has sent, which is life eternal.”

“The god of this world hath *blinded* the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.”*—“The veil is upon their heart. But when it (that veiled heart) shall turn unto the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit [which taketh away the veil:] and where the *Spirit of the Lord is*, there is liberty”† to behold “the light of the glorious gospel of Christ.” Then “God, who commanded the *light* to shine out of darkness, shineth in our hearts, to give the *light* of the *knowledge of the glory of God*, in the face of Jesus Christ :”‡ and then, “we all with *unveiled* face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the *Spirit of the Lord.*”||

These important truths will receive further confirmation from the following scriptural arguments.

(1.) The Apostles received their verbal instructions from the best of Teachers, who “spake as never man spake.” The lessons which they received from him, were the most intelligible that, under existing circumstances, could be devised. The matter of them was adapted to the state of

* 2 Cor. iv. 2.

† Cor. iii. 17.

‡ 2 Cor. iv. 6.

|| 2 Cor. iii. 18.

their minds : for he “ spake the word unto them as they were able to bear it :” and the terms in which they were dictated were appropriate and familiar. He answered all their questions, obviated their difficulties, and replied to the doubts which they did not dare to utter. But notwithstanding the unparalleled propriety with which he taught them, it was necessary that they should be divinely illuminated to understand his meaning. “ These things have I spoken unto you, (said he) being yet present with you. But the Comforter, (which is) the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall *teach you all things*, (and bring all things to your remembrance,) whatsoever I have said unto you.”*—At another time, “ he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me.” But they *had not understood* the things which he had said unto them, while he was yet with them. “ Then (therefore) *opened he their understanding*, that they might understand the scriptures.”—If then, the Apostles needed that Jesus Christ should “ *open their understanding*, that they might understand the *scriptures*,” and that the Father should send “ the Holy Ghost to teach them all things whatsoever the Son had said unto them ;”—what arrogance is it for a Socinian to profess to teach his followers in such a manner, that they shall need neither that Christ should open their understanding, nor that the Holy Ghost should illuminate their mind !

(2.) “ No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.” “ If ye had known me, (said Jesus,) ye should have known my Father also.”† “ But as no one knoweth the Father save the Son, so no one knoweth the Son but the Father.”‡ “ No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.”|| When “ Simon Peter” said, “ Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,—Jesus answered, and said unto him, Blessed art thou Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but

* John xiv. 25, 26. † John xiv. 7. ‡ Matt. xi. 27. || 1 Cor. viii. 3.

my Father which is in heaven.”* What our Lord said to his disciples, is therefore equally applicable to every other human being: “I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you (my church) for ever; even the *Spirit of truth*; whom the world cannot receive [not because the Father is unwilling to send him, but] because it seeth him not, neither knoweth [acknowledgeth] him.—I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you [*in the Spirit.*]—Yet a little while, and the world [which cannot receive *the Spirit of truth*] seeth me no more; but ye see me (for I am still with you by *the Spirit of truth*:) because I live and ye shall live also. At that day [when *the Spirit of truth* is come,] ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and *he that loveth me* [whether he be an Apostle or a private Christian, of the first or of the nineteenth century,] shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will *manifest myself to him*.”—The Socinians do not need to exclaim, ‘Impossible!’ for one, not a regularly accredited member of their corps, has prevented them. “Judas said unto him, (not Iscariot,) Lord, *how* is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered, and said unto him, If a man [at any time, or in any part of the world] love me, he will keep my words: and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him [*by the Spirit* which ‘shall be in you,’] and make our abode with him.”†

(3.) Hence the Apostle John, addressing his general epistle to the *private* members of the Christian Church, some of whom were mere “*babes in Christ*,” says, “Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists. But *ye* have an *unction* from the Holy One, and *ye* know all things [which are essential to Christianity, and connected with your welfare.] I have not written unto you because *ye* know not the truth, but because *ye* know it, and that no lie is of the truth. Who is a liar, but he that de-

* Matt. xvi. 16, 17.

† John xiv. 16.—23.

nieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the *Father* and the *Son*. Whosoever denieth the *Son*, the same hath not the *Father*. Let that therefore abide in you which ye have *heard* [by *verbal* instruction] from the beginning, [and which ye *know* by the *anointing* which ye have from the Holy One].—These things have I written unto you concerning them that seduce you.” As to the truth concerning the Father and the Son, from which those seducers wish to draw you aside, I need not write to you. “ But the *anointing* which ye have received of him abideth in you, [giving you the proper knowledge of those things which ye have heard from the beginning,] and ye need not that any man teach you [those things].—But, as the same anointing [still] teacheth you of all [the] things [which ye have heard from the beginning], and is truth, and is no lie, [is a true anointing from the Holy One, and leadeth you into the knowledge of the truth], and [teacheth] even as it *hath* taught you, [I trust] ye shall [still] abide in him.”

The argument thus deduced from scripture is equally as conclusive with respect to the modern Christian world, as with respect to the primitive Christian church. Now, as in the beginning, “ no one knoweth the things of God, but the Spirit of God, and he to whom the *Spirit* of God has revealed them.” When the Socinians undertake to prove the contrary, they are called to prove, either—that there is now an essential difference in the faculties of the human mind,—that there is some method of obtaining the knowledge of spiritual things, on which the scriptures are silent,—or, that the same knowledge is not now necessary for the same purposes. We have learned from themselves not to be surprised if any of them should venture to *undertake* such a task; but the *accomplishment* of it would be ranked among the greatest achievements of this adventurous age. The conqueror of this difficulty will be the man to prove to the world, either—that eyes and light are not *now* necessary to vision,—or that the most important affairs of human life may *now* be transacted as well without it.

2. According to the sacred scriptures, the influence of the Spirit of God is necessary to make mankind holy.

We shall not need to review the scriptural arguments by which it has been already proved, that the hearts of mankind are morally diseased. The fact, sufficiently glaring in itself, we shall here take for granted. The question now is, By what means is this moral disorder to be counteracted and cured?—Without disregarding or underrating any mean which God has seen good to provide or to enjoin, we reply, “By the influence of the Holy Spirit.” This is, perhaps, the true reason that the epithet *holy*, is so much more frequently applied to *the Spirit*, than to the Father or the Son: not because *he* is more holy than *they*; but because he is the immediate author of our purification,—“*the Spirit of Holiness.*”

That the ordinary operations of the Spirit are such as to destroy the constitutional freedom of the human mind, suspend its volitions, irresistibly direct its choice, or supersede the necessity of human exertions, is no part of our creed. We are not disposed to make an unprovoked attack on those who on this subject may see reason to differ from us; but we deem it necessary to guard the truth against those objections which are frequently taken from an hypothesis to which we cannot subscribe. As we cannot vindicate the doctrine of irresistible grace, we must avoid meeting an antagonist on that ground, by denying it. We do not conceive of the agency of the Spirit as of a mechanical motion, a chymical operation, or a magical charm; but as of the agency of one intelligent and free Being upon another being who is also intelligent and free. We therefore no more suppose that the influence of the Spirit of holiness does violence to the human will, than that Satan, by his temptations, forces men to sin. In every thing in which man is accountable, we conceive he remains a moral agent; or there could be no moral turpitude in his sin, or moral rectitude in his services. With the sacred writers, we suppose that the grace of God may possibly be received in vain, that the Holy Ghost may be resisted, may be grieved, or may even be quenched; and that some have done despite to the Spirit of Grace.

This being premised, we proceed to examine whether, according to the scriptures, all the holiness and righteousness of human nature be not imputed to the influence of the Holy Spirit.

(1.) The first step which a sinner can take towards holiness, is *repentance*.—It will not be denied that repentance is sorrow for sin, producing sincere desires and strong resolutions to amend:—a steadfast purpose to “cease to do evil, and learn to do well.” That this is an act of the human will, is undeniable. Hence “God commandeth all men every where to repent.”* On the other hand, however, it is the *gift* of God. “Him hath God exalted with his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give *repentance* to *Israel*, and forgiveness of sins.”† When, therefore, the Apostles heard of the conversion of Cornelius and his house, “they glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted *repentance* unto life.”‡—Had it been said that Jesus Christ *came into the world* to give *repentance*, the Socinians could have given the subject an easy turn, by stating that Jesus Christ came to *preach* the doctrine of *repentance*. But the case before us is a little different from this. That Jesus Christ “came to call sinners to *repentance*,” is a great truth; but it is equally a truth that he is “exalted to give *repentance*.” In what sense, then, is that *repentance given*?

Before a sinner can properly repent, he must know himself to be a sinner in the sight of God:—he must be convinced that in God’s account “sin is exceeding sinful:”—he must be deeply impressed with the thought, that “the end of these things is death.” But these are among those spiritual truths, the proper, practical knowledge of which, we have already seen, can be received only in the light of the Spirit of God. Hence, Jesus Christ, when he promised to send the Comforter to his disciples, said “When he is come, he will reprove (or convince) THE WORLD of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.”||

(2.) The next step which a sinner must take in order to his salvation is, to *come to Christ*.—Hence our Lord, ad-

* Acts xvii. 30. † Acts v. 31. ‡ Acts xi. 18. || John xvi. 8.

dressing himself to penitent sinners, says “*Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest.*”* But has he not said also, “*No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him?*”† Now, in order to *draw* us to the Son, the Son must be *revealed* to us: revealed to us in the *attractive* charms of his benevolent character, as the Friend and Saviour of mankind, who “*receiveth sinners.*” The Father, therefore, reveals the Son. “*It pleased God (says St. Paul,) who called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me.*”‡ For this purpose he must “*give to the sinner an understanding* to know him that is true.”|| The Father must give to him the Spirit of truth whereby Christ has promised to *manifest* himself to him, that he may see him whom the world cannot see. Compare John xiv. 16, 19, 21, &c.—*To come to Christ,* is “*practically to believe on him.*” “*He that cometh to me, shall never hunger; (says he) and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.*”§ But this faith is the gift of God. “*To you it is given to believe on him.*”¶ And it is given by a divine operation, and is therefore called, “*a faith of the operation of God.*”**

(3.) The immediate object of a sinner’s coming to Jesus Christ, is, that through him he may come to the Father. “*He is able to save them to the uttermost that come to God by him.*”†† “*I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father but by me.*”††—We have just seen that “*to come to Christ,*” is *to believe in him.* But a sinner believes in *Christ*, that he may believe in *God*. He trusts in the *redeeming* love of the *Son*, that he may trust in the *pardoning* love of the *Father*. “*If ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man’s work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear; for as much as ye know that ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, who was manifest in these last times for you, who by him do believe in God that raised him up from the dead and gave him glory, that your faith and*

* Matt. xii. 28.

† John vi. 44.

‡ Gal. i. 15, 16.

|| 1. John v. 20.

§ John vi. 35.

¶ Phil. i. 29.

** Col. ii. 12.

†† Heb. vii. 25.

†† John xiv. 6.

*hope might be in God.** Here then we are to consider, [1.] that the Father is revealed to us in the Son, by the Spirit. “At that day,” says our Lord, [when the Comforter, the Spirit of truth is come, that he may abide with you for ever] ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you:”†—[2.] that this is involved in our coming to the Father by him, and that they are connected by our Lord, if not identified. “No man (says he) cometh unto the Father but by me. If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also; and from henceforth ye know him and have seen him.”‡—[3.] that a sinner is encouraged to come to the Father by beholding him in the Son, and to depend on his forgiving love by knowing the redeeming love of the Saviour.—All this is comprehended in one sentence by the Apostle, who says, “Through him we have an access by one *Spirit* unto the Father.”||

(4.) The result of a sinner’s coming to God by Jesus Christ is his *regeneration*. Hence the Apostle Peter, having addressed the Christians of his time, as “through Christ believing in God, who raised him from the dead, and gave him glory, that their faith and hope might be in God,”—subjoins: “seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth *through the Spirit*,—being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.”§ So the Evangelist John states, that to “as many as received him (‘the Word of God,’ who, ‘full of grace and truth,’ hath ‘declared the Father;’) to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were *born*, (not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but) *of God.*”§

From the language of St. Peter, it is obvious that, in his opinion, to be *born again* is synonymous with “having purified our souls.”—In the conversation of our Lord with Nicodemus, the same idea is couched under similar terms. Jesus said unto him, Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be

* 1 Pet. i. 17—21. † Compare John xiv. 16—20. ‡ John xiv. 6, 7.
|| Eph. ii. 12. § 1 Pet. i. 22, 23. ¶ John i. 1, 12—14, 1.

born when he is old? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of *the Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of *the Spirit*, is spirit."*—From this passage we gather, [1.] That the new birth is a necessary preparation for a man's entrance into the kingdom of God. [2.] That it is a preparation necessary for every one born of a woman. [3.] That it is a change which our Lord here calls being *made Spirit*, in opposition to that which is born of the *flesh*, and *is flesh*.—These phrases we interpret as relating to the moral disposition of the mind. To be *flesh*, in scriptural language, is to be *carnally-minded*:—to be *spirit* is to be *spiritually-minded*. In this sense, the Apostle Paul uses these and similar terms, as in the following passage: "They that are after the *flesh*, do *mind* the things of the *flesh*; but they that are after the *Spirit*, the things of the *Spirit*. For to be *carnally-minded* is death; but to be *spiritually-minded* is life and peace. Because the *carnal* mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." It therefore renders a man unfit for the kingdom of God. "So then they that are in the *flesh* cannot please God. But ye are *not* in the *flesh*, but in the *Spirit*."<†

But whatever be the *nature* of the new birth, it is obvious that the Spirit of God is the efficient *cause* of it. Thus our Lord says, "Except a man be born of *the Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."—"That which is born of *the Spirit*, is spirit."—"So is every one that is born of *the Spirit*".‡ St. Peter bears testimony to the same important truth, when he says, that the believers to whom he wrote, had purified their souls *by obeying the truth*, and thus were born of incorruptible seed, by the word of God; for he observes that they had obeyed the truth "*through the Spirit*".||

The idea which we have of a *birth* is that of an introduction to natural life; *to be born again, or to be born of the Spirit*, is, therefore, "*to be introduced into spiritual life*."

* John iii. 3, 6. † Rom. viii. 5—9. ‡ John iii. 5, 6, 8. || 1. Pet. i. 22.

"To be *spiritually-minded* is *life*."^{*} To begin to be spiritually-minded, is therefore to begin to *live*. Hence St. Peter, addressing himself to those of whom he speaks as "born again," exhorts them, "As *new-born babes* desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." The sacred writers, therefore, speak of the same subject under the idea of a spiritual resurrection. "Even when we are dead in sins, he hath quickened us together with Christ."[†] "And you, being dead in your sins, hath he quickened together with him."[‡] But this resurrection is effected by the Spirit. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth."^{||}—If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead, because of sin; but the spirit is life, [lives] because of righteousness.[§] If we live in [or by] the Spirit, (says St. Paul to the Galatians) let us also walk in [or by] the Spirit."[¶]

As regeneration is the beginning of spiritual life, that life is a *new* life. "We are buried with Christ by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."^{**} But this *renewal* of life, in regeneration, is effected by the Holy Spirit: "He saved us (says St. Paul) by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."^{††}

As they who are born of woman, are born in the likeness of their parents, so they who are born of God, are born in his *image*. "That which is born of the *flesh*, is *flesh*; and that which is born of the *Spirit*, is *Spirit*." It is therefore observed by the Apostle John, that "if ye know that he is *righteous*, ye know that every one which doeth *righteousness* [who is righteous] is born of him."^{††} *To be renewed in the spirit of one's mind*, is "to put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."^{|||} This moral image of God, in which we are renewed, is attributed to the agency of the Spirit. "We

* Rom. viii. 6. † Eph. ii. 5. ‡ Col. ii. 13. || John vi. 23.

§ Rom. vii. 9. 13. ¶ Gal. v. 25. ** Rom. vi. 4.

†† Tit. iii. 5, 6. ¶¶ 1 John ii. 29. ||| Eph. iv. 23, 24.

all with open face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are changed into *the same image* from glory to glory, as by *the Spirit of the Lord.*"

In these passages it is observable, that in whatever point of light the scriptures view the change of a sinner's heart, whether in its nature, or in its effects, whether the allusion to human generation be preserved, laid aside, or exchanged for some other mean of elucidation,—they uniformly attribute it to the Spirit of God.

(5.) From the time that this change takes place, the Holy Spirit condescends to *inhabit* the heart which is thus renewed. This is the substance of what our Lord graciously promised to his disciples. The Comforter, said he, "is with you, and shall be *in you.*"* This promise was fulfilled even in private Christians. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God (says St. Paul); but ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God *dwell* in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his."† Every real Christian (and such is every regenerate person) has therefore the Spirit of God within him. Hence St. Paul, addressing the Corinthians, speaks on this subject with the utmost confidence, and in a manner that admits of no exception: "What! know ye not that your body is the *temple* of the Holy Ghost which is *in you*, which *ye have of God?*"‡ And again: "Know ye not that ye are the *temple* of God, and that the Spirit of God *dwellmeth in you?*"|| The same Apostle has another passage which requires an application only to *private* Christians, and extends to all succeeding ages. "Through him [Christ] we both [Jews and Gentiles] have an access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now, therefore, ye [Gentiles] are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the *Apostles and Prophets*, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God

* John xiv. 17.

† Rom. viii. 8, 9.

‡ 1 Cor. vi. 19.

|| 1 Cor. iii. 16.

through the Spirit."*—In this passage the Reader will perceive, [1.] That a distinction is made between the apostles and prophets on the one part, and the *private* Christians who are builded on them, on the other part. [2.] That Jews and Gentiles are included: the former as built upon the prophets; the latter upon the apostles. [3.] That all these are said to be "an habitation of God through the Spirit." [3.] And that this habitation of God is said to "grow unto an *holy temple* in the Lord :" an expression which at once implies a continual accession of members to the Christian church, which still continues to be the habitation of God, and that it is always sanctified by his immediate presence.

(6.) This leads us to observe, that to the indwelling *Spirit* the *sanctification* of the saints, whether initial, or complete, is uniformly attributed. It is this, according to the passage which we have just now examined, that makes the "habitation of God" "grow into a *holy temple* in the Lord." With this the scriptures in general accord. "Such (says St. Paul, to the Corinthians) were some of you : but ye are washed, but ye are *sanctified*, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the *Spirit of our God*."† To the Thessalonians he writes, "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through *sanctification of the Spirit*, and belief of the truth."‡ And to the Romans he speaks of himself as "the minister of *Jesus Christ* to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being *sanctified* by the *Holy Ghost*."||—It is true, indeed, that the Holy Spirit uses subordinate means for our sanctification. Hence the Corinthians are exhorted to "cleanse themselves from *all filthiness of the flesh and Spirit, perfecting holiness* in the fear of God." But it is equally true that this exhortation is founded on the *promises* of God. "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves," &c.§ Now one of the promises to which St. Paul alludes, according to the preceding chapter, is, "Ye are the *temple* of

* Eph. ii. 18—22.

† 1 Cor. vi. 11.

‡ 2 Thess. ii. 13.

|| Rom. xv. 16.

§ 2 Cor. vii. 1.

the living God; as God hath said, I will *dwell* in them and *walk* in them.”*

(7.) From the sanctification, which, in all its various stages, is the effect of our being an habitation of God through the Spirit, all holy and acceptable *obedience* flows. “A good man out of [this] good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth good things.” “The tree is (hereby) made good, and consequently produces good fruit.”† The apostle Peter, therefore, speaks of his believing brethren in the Lord as being “elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through *sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience.*”‡—For this reason, Christian obedience is, by that Apostle, attributed in the very same chapter, to the same Spirit. “Ye have purified your souls in *obeying* the truth ¶through the Spirit.”||—But this subject requires a more extended investigation.

[1.] The first thing requisite to all holy obedience is the *knowledge* of our duty. Hence St. Paul prayed for the Colossians that they “might be filled with the *knowledge* of the *will* of God, in all wisdom, and spiritual understanding; that they might walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work.”§—It is certain, indeed, that God has declared his will by his holy law. It is equally certain, that God sees it necessary, and that he has graciously promised, to “put his law into our mind,”¶ or understanding. This he does by his Spirit. “Ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but *with the Spirit of the living God*: not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart.”**—In other words: It is necessary that God should “guide us with his counsel, and afterwards receive us to glory.”†† And for this purpose “his Spirit is good, and leads into the land of uprightness.”‡‡ This *guidance of the Spirit* is granted to all his children; for “as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.”|||

[2.] The next thing essential to holy obedience, is a *disposition* to do the will of God. “*Incline my heart unto*

* 2 Cor. vi. 16. † Matt. xii. 33, 35. ‡ 1 Pet. i. 2. || 1 Pet. i. 22.

§ Col. i. 10. ¶ Heb. viii. 10. ** 2 Cor. iii. 3.

†† Psalm lxxiii. 21. ‡‡ Psalm cxlii. 10. ||| Rom. viii. 11.

thy testimonies, (said David) and not to covetousness."* St. Paul prayed that the Philippians might "approve things that are excellent; that they might be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ, being filled with the fruits of righteousness."† For this purpose he informs them, "it is God, which worketh in you both to *will* and to do of his good pleasure."‡ And for this purpose God promises not only to "put his law in our *mind*," that we may *know* it, but to write it on our *heart*,|| that we may *love* it.—But this is effected by the Spirit: for as "the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, the Spirit lusteth [desireth] against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that *μη τοιποτε*, ye *may* not do the things that ye [otherwise] would."§

[3.] It is also necessary to actual obedience, that we be *strengthened to do the will of God*.—"Without me," says Jesus Christ, "ye can do nothing."¶—But, on the other hand, "I can do all things," said St. Paul, "through Christ which strengtheneth me."** It is by the Spirit, however, that Jesus Christ strengtheneth his followers. "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities."†† For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would grant unto you to be *strengthened with might* by his Spirit in the inner man.†††

In this way the promise of God to his people by the prophet Ezekiel, is fulfilled. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them."|||

If we inquire into the source of every grace which forms the Christian character, we shall find that they all take their rise from these combinations of his various influence.

* Psalm cxix. 36. † Phil. i. 10, II. ‡ Phil. ii. 13. || Heb. vii. 10.

§ Gal. v. 17. ¶ John xv. 5. ** Phil. iv. 13.

†† Rom. vii. 26. ††† Eph. iii. 11, 16. |||| Ezek. xxxvi. 25,—27

Thus PIETY, MORALITY, and VIRTUE, owe to him their very existence.

[1.] The Holy Spirit is the source of all genuine PIETY.—What is piety, but sincere and supreme *love* to God? “ This is the first and great commandment : Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.”*

But love to God is one of God’s greatest gifts. “ The LORD directs our hearts into the love of God.”† He has therefore graciously promised, that he will “ circumcise our heart, to love the Lord our God with all our heart, and with all our soul, that we may live.”‡ This great gift, God bestows by the operation of his Holy Spirit. “ God hath not given us the *Spirit of fear*; but of power, of *love*, and of a sound mind :”|| i. e. the *Spirit* by which power, and love, and sobriety are given to us, or wrought in us.—“ I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he would grant unto you to be strengthened by his Spirit’s might in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith, that ye being rooted and grounded in love,” &c.§—Again : “ Who declared unto us your love in the Spirit.”¶

[2.] The Holy Spirit is the source of all genuine MORALITY.—If love to God be the soul of piety, love to mankind is the soul of sincerity, veracity, fidelity, equity, mercy, benevolence, and beneficence to man. “ If there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt *love* thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour : therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.”** But this commandment is obeyed only by the aid of the Holy Spirit. “ Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the *Spirit*, unto *unfeigned love of the brethren*, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently.”†† And as love to our neighbour is the effect of the influence of the Spirit, so all veracity, justice, and benevolence, which are the inseparable companions of love, spring from the same source : “ for

* Matt. xxii. 37, 38. † 2 Thess. iii. 5. ‡ Deut. xxx. 6. || 2 Tim. i. 7.
§ Eph. iii. 11—17. ¶ Col. i. 2. ** Rom. xiii. 9, 10. †† 1 Pet. i. 22.

the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth."*

[3.] The Holy Spirit is the source of all virtue.—Temperance, sobriety, chastity, deadness to the world and to all the means of sensual gratification which it affords, with the subjugation of every opposite passion, are the virtues of a Christian. "Risen with Christ," he is called to "seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God,"—to "set his affection on things above, not on things on the earth,"—and to "mortify his members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry."† But "the works of the flesh, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like,—are diametrically opposite to these virtues."‡ "They (therefore) who are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts,"|| by "walking in the Spirit, that they may not fulfil the lusts of the flesh."§ "Through the Spirit they mortify the deeds of the body that they may live."¶

In a word: As "the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, teacheth all men, that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, they should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world,"—all these are produced by the Spirit of God. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, [the graces of piety] long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, *πίσις*, fidelity, [the duties of morality] meekness, temperance" [the government of our mental passions, and of our bodily appetites, or personal virtue].

3. The influence of the Spirit is necessary to the *happiness* of a Christian.

It perhaps will not be denied that every truly good man is a *happy* man; or that he who is a *Christian* in heart and deportment, enjoys the proper *comforts* of Christianity. Our Lord has pronounced every stage of true religion

* Eph. v. 9.

† Col. iii. 1, 2, 5.

‡ Gal. v. 19—21.

|| Gal. v. 24.

§ Gal. v. 16.

¶ Rom. viii. 13.

blessed, or happy : not excepting that of “the poor in spirit,” of the “mournful,” of those that “hunger and thirst after righteousness,” or of those who are “persecuted for righteousness sake.” And God has decreed, that the ways of wisdom “are ways of *pleasantness*, that all her paths are *peace*: and that *happy* is every one that retaineth her.”*—But all the happiness of religion proceeds from the COMFORTER; and depends on our “walking in the COMFORT of the HOLY GHOST.”†

(1.) The first and most essential ingredient in real happiness is inward PEACE. Not that insensibility, carelessness, and ease, which characterize those who sleep secure upon the verge of hell, and who say to themselves, “Peace, peace, when there is no peace;” but the calm tranquillity of a mind perfectly awake to its real situation: “the peace of God which passeth all understanding, keeping the heart and mind through Christ Jesus.”‡ Of this inward serenity, every true follower of Christ is, in a greater or less measure, a partaker. “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.”|| “Peace,” said Jesus Christ to his disciples, “I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth, [deceitful, scanty, unstable,] give I unto you.”§

This peace, we have already seen, is one of the fruits of the Spirit. And what but the Spirit could communicate it? The deceiver of mankind may administer opiates to a guilty conscience, and sing the syren song to an unawakened sinner whom he rocks in the cradle of carnal security,—or the sinner may say to himself, “I shall have peace, though I walk after the imagination of my heart, adding drunkenness to thirst;”—none however can calm his yet awakened conscience, but he that says to the raging waves of the sea, “Be still! and there is a great calm.” None but HE can enable us to look God in the face, and to take a view of

That undiscovered country, from whose bourne
No traveller returns,——

and yet to sing, “O Lord, I will praise thee, though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou

* Prov. iii. 17. † Acts ix. 31. ‡ Phil. iv. 7. || Rom. v. 1. § John xiv. 27.

comfortest me." * Nothing could produce this, but what the Apostle calls, the love of God [the pardoning, paternal love of God] shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us." †

(2.) But Christianity affords not merely a *negative* consolation; it is full of *positive and present enjoyment*. All the wicked are "without God in the world." To return to their duty, is to "return unto the Lord,"—to "draw nigh unto God,"—to "seek the Lord while he may be found."—But this return to their duty is followed by a restoration to felicity. "Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of hosts." ‡—Draw nigh unto God, and he will draw nigh unto you. ||—Ye shall seek me, and find me when ye shall search for me with all your heart." § This done, they say with the Psalmist, "The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance, and of my cup." ¶—Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee." **

In possession of such a portion, a Christian is unspeakably happy.

When God is mine and I am his,
 Of paradise possest,
I taste unutterable bliss,
 And everlasting rest.

He "joys in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom he has now received the reconciliation." † He cannot, however, rejoice in God unless he know that God is his,—that he is graciously *with* him, and *in* him. And how does he know this? As the Shechinah was the symbol of the presence of God in his holy temple, when he dwells in men by his Holy Spirit, he by that Spirit certifies them of his presence, and reveals his glory. "Hereby, (says St. John) we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." ‡‡ "I will pray the Father, (said our Lord) and he shall give you another Comforter, even the Spirit of truth:—he shall be in you.—At that day ye shall

* Isa. xii. 1.

† Rom. v. 5.

‡ Mal. iii. 7.

|| James iv. 8.

§ Jer. xxix. 13.

¶ Psalm xvi. 5.

** Psalm lxxiii. 25.

†† Rom. v. 11.

†† 1 John iii. 24.

know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you.” *

(3.) Religion has its HOPES, as well as its enjoyments.—The Christian’s hope is full of immortality: being “as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, entering into that within the veil, whither the fore-runner is for us entered.”† It is a hope of future glory. He is “begotten again to a lively hope of an inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for him.”‡ But the Spirit of God is the source of this hope. Hence that prayer of the Apostle: “Now the God of hope fill you with all joy, and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost.”||

The more closely we examine this subject, the more reason we shall see to attribute the Christian hope to the Holy Spirit.

[1.] The first thing necessary to the hope of glory, is a knowledge of the nature and value of that glory. But this knowledge is given by the illuminating Spirit. “I cease not,” says St. Paul to the Ephesians, “to make mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of your calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.”§

[2.] We cannot reasonably hope to participate this inheritance, unless we be assured of our title to it. As an inheritance, it is held in reversion for those who are *children and heirs*. How then does a man ascertain that he is “no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ?”¶ If the scriptural account be just, we receive this assurance from the Spirit. “God sends forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, ABBA, FATHER.”** And when we have received, not the Spirit of bondage unto fear, but the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, ABBA, FATHER,—*the self-same Spirit, αὐτὸς τοῦ πνεύματος*,

* John xiv. 16—20. † Heb. vi. 19, 20. ‡ 1 Pet. i. 3, 4. || Rom. xv. 13.
§ Eph. i. 16—18. ¶ Gal. iv. 7. ** Gal. iv. 6.

beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.”*

[3.] Whether a pledge and foretaste of future glory is, or is not, essential to the hope of it, it is a benefit which God bestows to increase the earnestness of a man’s desire for it, and to confirm his expectation. Such therefore is the blessing which is enjoyed by a Christian, and such are its effects. But this also is of the operation of the Spirit of God. “ We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven—that mortality might be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing, is God, who also hath given us the *earnest* of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.”† Hence St. Paul says to the Ephesians, “ We (Jews) should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ, in whom ye (Gentiles) also (trusted), after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, [that *Holy Spirit* which was promised,] which is the *earnest* of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.” He therefore, who can say with the Psalmist, “ Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee,”—can subjoin with him, “ My heart and my flesh faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and *my portion for ever.*”

(4.) Not only the *fruition*, but the *hope* of a Christian is a source of joy.—“ We rejoice,” says St Paul, “ in *hope* of the glory of God.”‡—He exhorts the Romans to be “ rejoicing in hope.”||—St. Peter addresses the scattered

* Rom. viii. 17. † 2 Cor. v. 1—2. ‡ Rom. v. 2. || Rom. xii. 12.

strangers, as “ begotten again unto a lively hope to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away,—wherin,” he says, “ ye greatly rejoice.”*—This joy in connection with the joy of present fruition, he represents as unutterable and glorious. “ That the trial of your faith,—might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ: whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable, and full of glory.”† But whether the religious joy of a Christian be common or extraordinary, the joy of hope or of fruition, it is the gift of God by the Holy Spirit: and to that Spirit it is uniformly attributed. “ The fruit of the Spirit (we have already seen) is joy,” &c.‡ “ Ye became followers of us and of the Lord (says St. Paul, to the Thessalonians,) having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost.”|| And this joy is one of the essential branches of Christianity; for “the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.”§

To give the Reader a clue to the doctrine of divine influence, to guide him through the intricacies of the multiplied passages which we have quoted, and to shew that in every gradation of religion, the work of human salvation is “ begun, continued, and ended” in the Holy Spirit,—we have divided our subject into three distinct heads, under which the different texts are arranged. It must not be supposed that the divine operations are always divided according to these artificial distinctions. The powers of the human mind have a reciprocal influence, and each promotes, retards, or changes, more or less, the operations of the other. Knowledge contributes to the choice of that which is good; and the uprightness of the choice renders knowledge more easy of attainment. The holiness of the human heart contributes to its felicity; while its felicity tends to increase its holiness. Again: Knowledge contributes to our enjoyment, while enjoyment increases the thirst for that knowledge, the happy influence of which we have felt; or, in other words,

* 1 Pet. i. 3, 4, 6.

† 1 Pet. i. 8.

‡ Gal. v. 22.

|| 1 Thess. i. 6.

§ Rom. xiv. 17.

happy experience makes us wiser.—In like manner : The various influences of the Spirit co-operate in one great design, the complete salvation of the souls of men from ignorance, sin and wretchedness. We are illuminated by the Holy Spirit, not for purposes of mere speculation, but that we may “know the truth, and that *the truth may make us free* ;” or, in other words, that we may be “*sanctified through the truth*.” There could be no moral, ameliorating change in the human heart, without the infusion of moral principles : and those moral principles must be apprehended by the understanding before they can govern the heart. As all moral action is founded in moral motives, those motives must be more or less distinctly perceived, before we can act under their impulse. There is, on the other hand, a certain influence of the Holy Spirit, which “God hath given (only) to them that *obey him*.” We must be “rooted and founded in love” before we can be “strengthened with the Spirit’s might in the inner man,” so as to “be able to comprehend with all saints the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that we may be filled into all the fulness of God.”—There is likewise a reciprocal co-operation of the sanctifying, and the consolatory, influence of the Holy Spirit. The gift of *repentance* is necessary to prepare us for divine consolation. “Blessed are they that *mourn*, for they shall be *comforted*.” The gift of *faith* is necessary as the immediate mean of our receiving the Holy Ghost to dwell within us ; for we receive it “by the hearing of faith.” On the other hand : When “the love of God to us is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us,”—“we love him because he has *first loved us*.” Our filial affection and consequent obedience, are not the causes, but the effects, of his paternal regard. “The joy of the Lord is our strength.” But this subject, though highly important and interesting, does not belong to the discussion of the Socinian controversy, which, without the introduction of any thing extraneous, has been already sufficiently protracted.—To return :

1. The difficulty of explaining the mode of the Spirit’s operation on the human mind, makes nothing against the reality of that operation. Every objection drawn from this source makes equally against any divine operation, whether

physical or moral, miraculous or common. It is enough for us to know that “God will give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him ;” and that it is our duty when we “live in the Spirit, to walk also in the Spirit.” As to the manner *how* that inestimable benefit is given, we know nothing. “The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit.” But it is not necessary that we should understand it. We do not see the worse, because we are unacquainted with the nature of light, or with the manner of its operation. Our food is not of less service to us, because we do not know how it is assimilated to our constitution, or how it nourishes our bodies. Our not knowing *how* we live, needs not hinder our living to the best purpose. Nor does our ignorance of “the way of the Spirit,” need to hinder our reception of it, or the accomplishment of that great purpose for which it is given, the salvation of our souls.

2. Whatever others may pretend, Socinians cannot consistently urge that the world is already christianized, and that it needs not, therefore, that divine influence which was once necessary for the conversion of heathen idolaters. According to Dr. Priestley, and his History of Corruptions, the whole of simple Christianity is overwhelmed in falsehood, and the Christian world is full of idolaters who worship a mere man instead of the Eternal God. At this rate, we are mere Christian Heathens, and almost need a restoration of the miraculous gifts, to effect a reformation of the reformed. Their objections must therefore take another shape. They will rather urge :

3. “That it is naturally in the power of man to do the will of God, must be taken for granted, if we suppose the moral government of God to be at all an equitable one. He that made man, certainly knew what he was capable of, and would never command him to do what he had not enabled him to perform; so as to propose to him a reward which he knew he could never attain, and a punishment which he knew he had no power of avoiding.”*

* Dr. Priestley's Hist. of Cor. Vol. I. p. 281.

That the government of God is equitable, and that he does not require any thing which is impossible, is, and must be, granted. But in arguing from these premises, this Socinian patriarch has made no less than three mistakes.

(1.) He has altogether neglected to inquire *what* is the will of God with respect to mankind. According to the New Testament, it is the will of God that we “walk in the light while we have the light,”—that we “come to the light that our deeds may be reproved,”—that we “believe according to the working of his mighty power,”—that we “obey the truth through the Spirit,”—that we “by the Spirit mortify the deeds of the body,”—that we “walk in the Spirit,”—that we bring forth “the fruit of the Spirit,”—and that “we grieve not the Holy Spirit of God.”—Had the Doctor considered this, he would have found it perfectly unnecessary to inquire, whether man have a *natural* power to do the will of God without the *light*, the *power*, the *Spirit* of God; for the very language in which God has declared to us his will, implies that we have naturally no such power.

(2.) He has neglected to make a distinction between our being *naturally* able to do the will of God, and our being enabled to do it by *supernatural* grace. Mankind may be in fact able to do the will of God, and so be without excuse, and yet their ability may be not *natural*, but *supernatural*. And this we take to be the scriptural truth. “Without Christ, we can do nothing,”* but “can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth us.”† On this ground, we grant that the whole will of God is practicable. But when Dr. Priestley so unceremoniously “takes for granted, that it must be *naturally* in the power of man to do the will of God,”—he takes for granted the very thing which he ought to have proved!

(3.) He has neglected to distinguish between a physical and a moral inability. A man may be supposed to be *physically* able to “deny himself,”—to “crucify the flesh with the passions and desires,”—to “mortify the deeds of the body,”—to renounce the world,—or even to love God; yet

* John xv. 5.

† Phil. iv. 13.

if he be *morally* unable to do these things, if he have an aversion to them,—all his physical ability will avail nothing. But this *moral* inability is that for which we particularly contend. It is a contradiction in terms to say that man has a *natural* inclination to *deny himself*. It is the same as to say that he is *naturally inclined* to resist his *natural inclination*. The carnal mind may be changed to a spiritual mind; and, therefore, it has a *physical* capacity to love God and to obey his law. But so long as it is a *carnal* mind, it is *enmity* to God, and is *not* subject to his law, neither indeed *can* be. Obedience, in this state, is *morally* impossible. The mind of man may be physically free in its volitions; yet while “the flesh lusteth (causeth desires) against the Spirit,” unless those desires be counteracted, by “the Spirit which lusteth, (causeth desires) against the flesh,” the man is in *moral* bondage, and will still “walk in the flesh” and “obey it in the lusts thereof.” It is not impossible for us to “work out our own salvation;” but it is only rendered possible by God who “worketh in us to *will* and to *do*, of his good pleasure.”*

4. Yes, says the Doctor, “God works all our works in us and for us, not by his own immediate agency, but by means of those powers which he has given us for that purpose?”†

In reply to this, we will ask a few plain questions.—When God is said to have *given* to the Gentiles, repentance unto life,—to have *given* to the Philippians, to believe,—and to have purified the heart of Cornelius by faith,—is nothing meant but that he had given to them faculties capable of repentance, faith, and holy obedience? Had they not, at this rate, repentance before they repented, faith before they believed, and purity in the midst of all their filthiness? And since God has given to all men the same powers, does it not follow that God has given to all men repentance, faith, and purity of heart? When Jesus Christ is said to be “exalted a Prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel,” is it meant that he was exalted to give to the Israelites those powers which they had possessed from their infancy? Is not this something like being ex-

* Phil. ii. 12, 13. † Hist. of Cor. Vol. I. p. 283.

altered to create those who were already created?—A hundred such questions might be proposed, all tending to shew, how little they who make these assertions, attend to the word of God!

There is a manifest distinction between the powers which God has given us by nature, and that which is necessary to the proper and effectual use of them. A man may have eyes, and yet be blind: ears and be deaf: hands and feet, and be maimed or lame: all the members of the human body, and be so paralyzed as to have no use of them: and lungs, which are rotten and cannot respire. The first thing he will want therefore is a cure.—Again: It is not enough that God has given us *eyes*; we cannot *see* till he has also given us *light*. Our ears would not answer the purpose of *hearing*, if we lived in *vacuo*, or if the air were robbed of its *elasticity*. Our members, though in themselves formed for motion, would not move at our will, unless God had superadded something to which we find it difficult to give a name. And our vital organs would answer no purpose of life without the vital air for respiration.—The judicious Reader is left to make the application.

To conclude: The dogmas of philosophical and rationalizing Divines, and the dreams of Enthusiasts, though directly opposed to each other, are equally distant from the doctrine of the sacred writings. Socinians, and less consistent Trinitarians, may reject the plain testimony of scripture, deny all intercourse with heaven, and ridicule the profession of serious Christians as the cant of hypocrisy; while impostors and madmen impute to the Spirit of God their imaginary revelations, or absurd and unscriptual impressions: the one may renounce the truth of God, and the other may abuse it; but it stands on its own basis, and is immovable as the Rock on which the Christian church is built.

Granting that our Lord promised to his immediate followers, the knowledge of evangelical truth by direct inspiration, and those miraculous powers which demonstrated that they spake the wisdom and truth of God,—we have found it equally true that he promised the Holy Spirit, for other purposes, to all his followers in all ages,—that

promises have hitherto been fulfilled,—that the scriptures are faithful records of the fulfilment, as well as of the promise,—that the blessing is necessary to each individual of mankind,—and that “the same Lord is rich unto all that call upon him.” The *miraculous* powers were given for the introduction of Christianity, and for its establishment in the world: and they were not withdrawn until the important design was accomplished. The same necessity for them now no longer remains. The *ordinary* influences of the Spirit were originally promised for the personal salvation of each individual of mankind. That purpose is not yet universally effected; but the same necessity for them remains. The cessation of the former, therefore, by no means implies the cessation of the latter. In six days God created the heaven and the earth, and all that are in them, and *rested* the seventh day. But a cessation from creation by no means implies that the divine energies are not still engaged in the preservation, propagation, and improvement, of the work of his hands.—Nor does God’s withdrawing those *extraordinary* powers by which the Christian Church was called into existence, argue that he will not be with his faithful servants “always even unto the end of the world.”

CHAPTER XVI.

The Conclusion.

IN examining and refuting the doctrines of modern Socinians, it can scarcely escape our observation that the source of their destructive errors, is the pride of reason. “ If any man consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to Godliness, he is proud.”* One who is a stranger to the case might naturally suppose, that a person born in a Christian country, and surrounded from his infancy by the direct or reflected light of divine revelation, would be satisfied with such a source of instruction, in every thing connected with God and religion. But this is not the case with those who run the race of *Socinianism*. As if every man were a fool, who does not light a taper of his own, to seek the meridian Sun, their belief of the divine testimony must be suspended, till from other sources they have demonstrated to themselves the being, attributes, and will of God. However difficult such a demonstration might be to one who has no previous knowledge of these subjects, it is not difficult to one who in fact is only seeking a proof of his own ingenuity, and who therefore can easily persuade himself that he has demonstrated, by reason, what he has really learned from revelation. The result of his imaginary researches, he calls *natural religion*.

Some of the principal doctrines of this *natural religion* are,—“ *God is*,” “ *God is one*,” “ *God is a Spirit*,” and “ *God is love*.” As the doctrines thus adopted are all borrowed from divine revelation, from thence they ought to be illustrated. For although our novice has imagined that he has perfectly *demonstrated* them, he has not even perfectly *understood* one of them. He knows neither what God is, what is the nature of his unity, what a Spirit is, nor how

* 1 Tim. vi. 3.

his love is modulated. It is easy to conceive the possibility, and the propriety, of receiving additional instruction from divine revelation, on subjects which as yet we have but imperfectly comprehended. But how is it possible for a man to reason conclusively from premises which he does not perfectly understand, and, which, therefore, he cannot compare? Is not this to build knowledge on ignorance? The superstructure raised on such a basis, is "a castle in the air." Yet this is the regular process of a philosophical religionist. Untutored by a celestial messenger,

Into the heaven of heavens he presumes,
An earthly guest.

From his crude notions of what God *is* in *some* respects, he boldly infers what he *must be* in *other* respects. From his dark, metaphysical ideas of spirit, and of the simplicity or unity of spirit, he concludes, by wholesale, that there can be no distinction in the Deity. And from his imperfect notion of the divine benevolence, as he calls it, he presumes to dictate what God must, and what he must not, do.

Having passed his novitiate, and, nurtured in academic groves, having become a staunch and positive philosopher, he is now prepared to make use of the book of revelation, as far as it will sanction his creed, or adorn his opinions. His adoption of the sacred code is however strictly guarded by this apophthegm, that "as reason is a partial revelation of the being, attributes, and will of God, a subsequent and more perfect revelation cannot contradict it." His philosophical system of "natural religion," is thus set up as an infallible test, by which every doctrine of divine revelation is to be tried. His reason is not, like that of a professed infidel, so far perverted, as to deny the divine mission, as he affects to call it, of Jesus Christ. But so confident is he of the precision of every previous induction of reason, that a system promulgated by divine authority is not permitted to convict him of any error in judgment. He is infallible. So complete is his information on almost every subject, and so competent has he found himself to the most abstruse ideas and reasonings, that every thing which rises above his present opinions, as well as whatever contradicts them, *must* be

erroneous. With such a preparation for the study of a supernatural revelation of those things which “no one knows but the Spirit of God, and he to whom the Spirit hath revealed them,” how is it possible but that many obvious scriptural truths must be discarded? “The wisdom of God in a mystery” is “foolishness” to one who is thus “wise in his own eyes, and prudent in his own conceit.”

To get rid of the difficulties which divine revelation has thrown in his way, is now the great work of our philosophical divine. This herculean task does not discourage those who, like Dr. Priestley, have resolved not to be convinced, and aver that the doctrines of the Trinity, and of the atonement, “are things which no miracles can prove.”* By what methods this is to be done, it was at one time intended here to exemplify. But the catalogue of “ways and means,” drawn merely from Mr. G.’s performance, became so long, and tedious, that it is now omitted. The Reader is therefore referred to the preceding pages for a sufficient number of examples of the unfair and unwarrantable means, in common use among Socinians, by which the Bible is to be purged from every thing that offends their illuminated reason.

But wherefore all these mighty efforts, in which the whole Socinian corps unite their strength, to purge from all mystery the revelation which the “great, mysterious God” has given of himself, his ways, and his will? Is Socinianism itself so clear and intelligible, that no difficulty remains? Have its votaries left no mystery unexplored? Have they explained what *God* is,—what the Divine *Spirit* is,—how he exists *without beginning, and without succession*,—how he *fills all space without extension*,—how he foresees the actions of men, and yet leaves them free?—how *evil originated* when as yet there was *nothing but good*? By no means. Nay, a Socinian is still a *mystery to himself*. He can explain neither how his *material body thinks*, nor how an *immaterial, thinking substance is united* with it. All this might, however, be forgiven, if he did not pretend to divest religion of all its *mysteries*. *To be ignorant* is human; but the *pride of understanding* was not made for man.—

* Hist. of Cor. Vol. II. p. 861.

“The foolishness of God, however, is wiser than men.” Of all the known systems of theology, the Bible which “explains all mysteries but its own,” has the fewest mysteries. Compare it with Socinianism, and it will be found that the latter, in attempting to remove the veil from the holy of holies, has hung the temple of God with cob-webs. The philosophical religion also has its mysteries: mysteries of its *own creation*. Mr. G. cannot get over the existence of the Devil, without substituting two mysteries for one. Thus, on the one hand, he has invented or borrowed the invention of an imaginary personage whom he calls “the angel of death,” and whom he supposes to hold a contest even with an arch-angel, about the departed soul of Moses. (See p. 56.) On the other hand, to supply the place of the Devil, he has invented an *abstract evil principle*, an *accident without a substance*, as mischievous as the Devil himself.—Lest it should appear that “the Word of God was *with* God” before his incarnation, some of Mr. G.’s brethren contrive to send the human nature of Christ up to heaven, before he opened his ministry, that he might receive his instructions and his commission. When Jesus Christ evinces his mysterious union with the Divine nature, by the Divine perfections which he exerted, and Mr. G. is forced to concede to him those perfections; this metaphysician contrives to abstract the divine perfections from the divine nature, and attributes them, in this abstracted form, to *mere humanity*. Here again, two mysteries are substituted for one! Here is the mystery of the *abstraction*: a mystery ten thousand times more profound, than that which should suppose that the rays of the sun, are abstracted from that luminous body with all their splendour. And here is the mystery of *delegation*, which supposes *infinite* perfections to be possessed by a *finite* being: a mystery infinitely greater than that which supposes this whole material creation to be inclosed in a nut-shell.—To exclude the mystery of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, many mysteries are invented. From these teachers of “*simple Christianity*,” we learn the mysteries of a *Spirit*, which is *not a Spirit*,—of a being who has no *real* existence,—who has *properties*, with-

out any substance in which they inhere,—*searches* all things without an *understanding*,—acts *voluntarily* without a *will*,—and is neither a *creature* nor the *Creator*.—To rid the world of the whole mystery of the *Trinity*, a *mysterious Unity* is invented, which more than equals the mystery of an *atom filling the universe*.—Nor have we yet explored all the mysteries of Socinianism. To set aside that of the miraculous conception, these philosophical divines give us our choice between a Saviour generated in the ordinary way, without partaking the ordinary defilement, and (as if Satan might cast out Satan,) a Saviour born a sinner to save his people from their sins.—The mystery of a proper “propitiation for our sins,” they have not found how to avoid, without first paying a compliment to the sacred writers, and supposing the Jewish sin offerings to have been “a figure for the time then present,” and then paying a compliment to their *idol*, and supposing the “offering for sin” made by the Son of God, to be so denominated by a figurative allusion to those offerings which were “a shadow of good things to come.” Thus the offering of Christ is *mysteriously* reduced to “the shadow of a shade;” and to add to the *mystery*, no *substance* is left to account for the derivation of either the shade or the shadow. Beside this, on the one hand, the beloved Son of God is supposed to have suffered the penalty of sin without any respect to sin committed by himself or by others, as the criminal cause; and on the other hand, God is supposed, as the moral Governor of the universe, to be at once *just* and the *justifier* of the ungodly who believe in *Jesus*, without any declaration of his righteousness by setting forth a propitiatory. Here again, the *mysteries* are multiplied. The *righteous* God is supposed to have inflicted the penalty where it was on no account due; and to have remitted it where it was properly and justly due, without even a qualified substitution of the persons, or any commutation of punishment. None but a Socinian can explain this mystery, which supposes *public justice* to punish the innocent, and to reward the guilty.—Having exhausted their own resources, and finding their own imagination insolvent, they now borrow the mysteries of that very church

against which they have protested. To blot out from the book of God the eternal punishment of the wicked, two Popish mysteries are revived. First, hell is turned into a purgatory : and then, the finally impenitent being eternally excluded from the congregation of the righteous, a new *limbus* is opened for their reception, between heaven and hell. So true it is that extremes meet in the *antipodes* of truth ! The Roman and the Socinian churches having separated, the one having gone into the extreme of superstition, and the other into the extreme of rational refinement, meet together in a fabulous *limbo*, or a chimerical purgatory.

Such are the mysterious absurdities which *rational* Christians can swallow and digest, while they reject the sublime and heavenly truths of the Gospel ! So true it is that more faith is required to make a Socinian or an Infidel, than to make a Christian.

The men who sincerely and cordially love the Bible, are now called upon to consider seriously how much it is transformed by these *calm investigators*. “ Let it be neither mine nor thine,” said the woman who was not the mother of the child in question, “ but divide it.” Such is the zeal of the Socinians to have their wisdom made current by the stamp of divine authority, that they rend in pieces the book of God, rather than not have it on their side. It is related by the Rev. W. Jones, whose anti-Socinian works deserve the most serious attention, that “ Dr. Samuel Clarke wrote a celebrated book upon the Being and Attributes of God ; and having discovered, as he thought, by the force of his own wit, what God is, and must be in all respects, he rejected the Christian doctrine of the Trinity ; and to put the best face he could upon his unbelief, spent much of the remainder of his life in writing ambiguous comments, and finding various readings, that is, in *picking holes* in the Bible.” The same is the constant practice of our Unitarian Divines. If they are to be believed, how small a part of the New Testament is genuine ! and how much is the rest *obscured* by their *clucidations* ! According to them its language is but unmeaning bombast ! It is a mere

"mountain in labour!" They glory in degrading it, by insinuating that it is almost replete with interpolations, false readings, contradictory representations, and unmeaning figures, and by charging the sacred writers with producing "lame accounts, improper quotations, and inconclusive reasonings."^{*} Nor does it at all concern them, that they are constantly undermining its authority; for Socinianism has borrowed all its wants, and can^t support its dignity by *reason*, without being any longer much beholden to *revelation*. But a Christian believer is as the Mother of the child, whose life was bound up in the life of her infant. "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"

The canons of criticism which the Socinians have adopted, are such as, if allowed, may equally serve to subvert every doctrine of the Bible, and to undermine the credit of the whole revelation of God. The arguments adduced to disprove the existence of the Devil, are equally sufficient to disprove the existence of all the heavenly hosts. The mode of reasoning which is used in quashing the evidence of the Divinity of the Word and of the Spirit, needs only a bold innovator, an eastern philosopher, who will venture, on the same ground, to destroy all positive evidence of the proper Divinity of the Father. If Socinians have disproved the proper atonement made by Jesus Christ, they can prove that his being slain "by the determinate counsel of God," was unjust and cruel: and can set aside both the mercy and the justice of God. The extraordinary influence of the Spirit of God, must fall before the artillery which levels the ordinary: and when it is made to appear that mankind heal the maladies of their own mind, and that the dead in sin arise without "the Spirit of life from God," the miracles of Christ and of his Apostles will need no longer to be attributed to "the finger of God." The criticisms which remove our dread of *eternal* misery, may equally subvert our hope in the *eternal* God, who, by an *everlasting* covenant, has promised us a kingdom which shall endure *for ever*.

* Dr. Priestley's 12th letter to Mr. Burn.

The authority of the Evangelists may as well be overturned by the same engine by which they attempt to overturn the authority of the Apostolic Epistles. Mr. Paine can furnish them with objections to the whole gospel, as specious as those which they exhibit against the first chapters of Matthew and Luke. And Moses and the prophets will come under the same sentence of condemnation with the Apostles and Evangelists; for their doctrine is the same, the latter relating as facts what the former predict as future. Dr. Priestley therefore made only an honest confession when he said, “ If the doctrine of *atonement* were really *scriptural*, I hesitate not to say, that, by me, the evidences of revealed religion would be deemed unsatisfactory.”

Let the subject be maturely considered, and it will be found that Socinianism destroys all the prominent features and vital parts of Christianity. What part of the system of human redemption does a Socinian believe? He talks loudly of the “ divine mission of Jesus,” and professes to regard him as a “ teacher sent from God:” But what honour does he put upon him, while, with Dr. Priestley, he accounts him “ fallible” like other men;* and, with Mr. G., he deems him a mere *time-server*, who accommodates his discourse to the fashionable superstition of the day; or a mere impostor, who pretending to cast out demons, when no such beings exist, makes a display of false credentials? (See p. 44.) With the exception of the resurrection of the human body, and of the truths which he supposes himself to have learned from reason, which of the peculiar doctrines of Christ does he believe? The story of Eve and the Serpent, though “ written for our learning,” he deems a fable which he does not care to explain. (See p. 44.) He denies, that “ by the offence of one [judgment came] upon *all men to condemnation*; and that by *one man’s* disobedience *many* were made sinners.” He will not allow, that “ the *Word*, which was made flesh, was *God*;” or if he acknowledge it, for a moment, it is only that he may deny it at a more convenient time, and under more auspicious cir-

* Def. of Unit. for 1787, p. 111.

cumstances. He makes it his chief concern to shew, that “ Christ hath [not] redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us ;”—that he is *not* “ the propitiation for our sins ;”—that “ we have [not] redemption through his *blood* the forgiveness of sins ;”—and that “ God hath [not] set him forth a propitiation through *faith* in his blood.” He counts it enthusiasm to say, that “ God will give his Holy Spirit to them that *ask* him.” According to him, there is no Devil, and therefore “ the Son of God was [not] manifested to destroy the works of the Devil.” Even the perfect example which Jesus Christ has left for his disciples, is ruined, for the support of Socinianism. If Dr. Priestley thought Jesus Christ, like other men, a *peccable* creature, Mr. G. has gone still further. He has found a tempter in the *breast* of the Holy One of Israel, and ascribes to our Saviour the thought of pursuing “ worldly objects” by the *abuse* of his miraculous powers. If Mr. G.’s comment, (See p. 55.) compared with the text, be true, the Son of God had it in contemplation to “ gratify his palate” by unwarrantable means; to satisfy a vain ambition, and “ command universal admiration” by an act approaching to suicide; and to prompt his separate interest, at the expence of the honour of God, by “ the *corrupt use* of his power.” If “ the thought of foolishness is sin,” what then becomes of the perfect Christian pattern?—If he be a materialist, he scouts the opinion, that “ when the earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens ;” and asserts that our only habitation for a while is in the dust of death. He robs the law of God of its *sanction*, by quenching “ the *unquenchable fire* ;” and the gospel of its *consolation*, by counting the blood of the covenant an unholy [a *common*] thing, and by denying the *Spirit of grace*.” He robs God of his peculiar *character*, as a supreme, *moral* governor; and man of his *liberty*, as a *moral* agent. In a word: he robs us of our *immortal* soul, and of our *Divine* Saviour; and what does he leave us to *fear* or to *hope*?

After these Socinian operations, what is left of Christianity to support even its existence? It is not only dismem-

bered, but embowelled, and robbed of its very vitals. As a mere code of morals, it may still subsist ; but, even in this respect, its strength will be impaired, and its effective force will be lost. It wants those striking demonstrations of God's hatred to sin, which beget religious fear, and those convincing proofs of his love to mankind, which are the most powerful arguments for their love, gratitude and obedience to him,—and which can be derived only from the propitiatory death of its great Author. But as a covenant of grace, established betwixt God and his offending and estranged creatures, it cannot possibly stand. If the moral, or legal, part of Christianity, may continue after the subversion of those doctrines which we have been called upon to vindicate, the *federal* part of it, and all that is properly *gospel* in it, must needs be involved with them in their ruin ; for that is all built upon the propitiation of Christ, and his propitiation upon his miraculous birth and his Divinity, which are therefore the foundation of the Christian religion.

But after all, let us not be understood as uttering the language of despondency. The past experience of true Christians of all denominations, is, to themselves at least, an answer to all the sophistry of the “*rational* Dissenters,” and an antidote to all their refinements. They may not be able to state with metaphysical precision the doctrines which they hold, nor to answer all the cavils of those who with a learned and imposing air impugn those doctrines ; but they “know of *whom* they have learned them,” and have found them “the power of God unto salvation.” St. John and St. Pau. will be acknowledged, and their doctrine will be “received with meekness, as the ingrafted word which is able to save the soul,” when Mr. G. and his Lectures are sunk into oblivion.

The ignorance and levity of some, have prepared them before-hand to fall into the snare which is laid for them. To these, *Socinianism* and *no religion*, are synonymous terms. From such converts the cause of vice, immorality, and profaneness, will gain more than the cause of which Mr. G. is the advocate. A while ago they paid but little attention to the Bible, and, after the first ferment is over, they will pay as lit-

tle to their new Leader. It is the property of Socinianism to quench all zeal but that of proselytism to its own system: and of that zeal, in such a cause, only a few refined spirits will be found possessed. A false Philosophy laid the foundation of this vacant temple, and that Philosophy only can raise the superstructure.

The decision of the important questions which are discussed in these pages is closely connected with our present and final happiness, as individuals. “To his own master each of us stands or falls.” Whether therefore the Reader be a teacher or a student of divinity,—refined or vulgar,—converted from ignorance to Socinianism, or perverted from Christianity,—lukewarm or zealous in the cause he has espoused;—whether he be in danger from Mr. G.’s sophistry, inclining towards his opinions, or established in them,—it may not yet be too late for him to consider that as the *precepts* of Christianity are the test of our *obedience*, its *doctrines* are intended to be the test of our *docility*; that he is as much accountable to God for his *religious opinions*, as for his *moral actions*; and that nothing but “the knowledge of the *truth* can make him *free*.”

INDEX TO THE SUBJECTS.

Page .	Page .
<i>ADAM</i> ,—made in the image of God, .. 295, 318	<i>Atonement</i> —made by the human nature of Christ, 199
his fall, 297	justice and mercy dis- played by the, .. 200
consequences of the fall of, 298, 322	whether a satisfaction, 202
begat a son in his own image, 294	consistent with repen- tance, mutual for- giveness, and obedi- ence, 206
posteriority of, involved, 302	of Christ, a purifica- tion, 209
reprieved with his pos- terity, 307	not made by the death of the Apostles, .. 211
state of, and his posteri- ty under a reprieve, .. 308	<i>See propitiation.</i>
his loss, and that of his posterity, 310	<i>Attribute</i> —the Holy Spirit not a mere, 103
and his posterity, under a new covenant, 312	<i>See perfections.</i>
scriptural objections an- swered, 315	
philosophical objections answered, 318	<i>BAPTISM</i> —institution of, connected with the doctrine of the Trinity, .. 65, 159
<i>Advocate</i> —Jesus Christ our, .. 194	
<i>Atw</i> — and its derivatives, .. 221	<i>Being</i> —its image and operation their analogy to the Trini- ty, 126
not indefinite, 224	
objections answered, .. 227	<i>Benediction</i> —in the name of Christ, 97
<i>Analogy</i> —what, 123	in the name of the Holy Spirit, 112
Trinity illustrated by, .. 124	in the name of the Trinity, 159
<i>Angel</i> —of Jehovah, Jesus Christ the 137	<i>Breath</i> —the Holy Spirit not pro- perly a 104
<i>Angels</i> —creation of 40, 42	
why so called, 41	
fall of, 41	
sin of, 42	
<i>Appearances</i> —of the word of God under the Old Testament, .. 136	<i>CHASTISEMENT</i> —distin- guished from pu- nishment, 216, 240
<i>Atheism</i> —socinianism allied to .. 105	
<i>Athenagoras</i> , 166	<i>Clemens</i> ,—of Rome, 163 of Alexandria, 166
<i>Atonement</i> —how made, 175	
what, 176	<i>Creation</i> —ascribed to Jesus Christ... 70
objections to answered .. 178	a proof of his Godhead, 73
death of Christ an, .. 184	
of Christ, taught by the divine messen- gers, 198	<i>DEMONS</i> —possessing man- kind, 43

	Page.		Page.
<i>Demons</i> —cast out,	43	<i>Fulness</i> —of God, dwelling in	
were spirits,	44	Christ,	77
chief of, the Devil, ..	45	<i>GOD</i> —being of, not first known	
<i>Depravity</i> —hereditary, .. 285, 324		from reason,	9
<i>See Adam</i> .		name of, given to Christ, 82, 155	
<i>Devil</i> —not known from reason, ..	16	term used in a subordinate	
not infinite,	40	sense,	86
chief of demons,	45	<i>Jesus Christ the true</i> , ..	87
disputation of, with Mi-		the great,	87
chael,	56	the only wise,	88
judgment of,	58	the mighty, .. 88, 141, 146	
offices of, ascribed to God,		the supreme and ever-bles-	
existence of, how connect-		sed,	90
ed with the doctrines of		<i>the Holy Spirit is</i> , .. 117, 121	
the Gospel,	61	<i>the Holy Spirit not a being</i>	
belief of, connected with		distinct from,	117
Christian duty,	61	<i>the Holy Spirit is cal-</i>	
consistent with our respon-		led,	118, 143
sibility,	62	<i>perfections of, ascribed to</i>	
<i>Distinction</i> —between the Father,		<i>the Holy Spirit</i> , .. 119, 143	
Son, and Holy Spi-		<i>word of, ascribed to the</i>	
rit, illustrated, .. .	125	<i>Holy Spirit</i> ,	121
consistent with unity, ..	129	<i>works of, ascribed to the</i>	
essential, necessary,		<i>Holy Spirit</i> , .. 121, 143	
and eternal,	129	<i>moral government of</i> , .. 213	
reasons for personal, ..	139	<i>human passions ascribed to</i>	255
not only personal, 129,	132	<i>Goodness</i> —ascribed to the Spirit	
		of God,	105
<i>EBIONITES</i>	339	<i>HEATHENS</i> —acknowledged	
<i>Emancipation</i> —terms of, ex-		their ignorance	
plained,	192	of divine things, 10	
<i>Equality</i> —of Christ with God, ..	80	could not ascer-	
<i>Eternity</i> —of future punish- ment, proved from the meaning of <i>αιων</i> , and its derivatives,	220	tain the immor-	
from the general tenor		tality of the soul, 19	
of scripture,	228	origin of divine	
objections to answered, ..	240	knowledge a-	
<i>Eve</i> —seduction of by the Devil ..	46	mong,	22
account of, not an allegory,	48	<i>Holiness</i> —ascribed to the Spirit	
<i>Evil principle</i> —absurdity of ab- stract,	49	of God,	105
<i>FATHER</i> —union of Christ		<i>Holy Ghost</i> — <i>See Spirit of God</i> .	
with	80		
<i>Figures</i> —scriptural, what, ..	103	<i>IDEAS</i> —origin of,	10
<i>Forgiveness</i> —of sins, not known		<i>Jehovah</i> —name of, ascribed to	
from reason, ..	16	Christ,	98
of sins, through the		<i>Jesus Christ</i> —temptation of ..	53
death of Christ, ..	187	pre-existence of ..	67
of injuries, not incon- sistent with the at-		creator of the world,	71
onement,	207	94, 146, 157	
		divine perfections as-	
		cribed to, .. 73, 156	
		divine perfection proof	
		of divinity of, ..	76
		divine nature ascribed to	76

	Page.		Page.
<i>Jesus Christ</i> —fulness of God in union of, with God, equality of, with God, denominated God, <i>See God.</i>	77 78 81 82	<i>Intelligence</i> —ascribed to the Spirit of God, 106 <i>Intercession</i> —of Christ, 195 <i>Job</i> —temptation of, not an allegory, 150	
the only Lord God, the blessed and only potentate, 93	92	<i>Irenaeus</i> 165, 333	
forgives sins, .. 93, 157		<i>Judicial terms</i> —explained, 194	
judges, 93, 158		<i>Justice</i> —how satisfied by Christ, 203 of punishing the unbelieving, 205	
the living God 93		<i>Justification</i> —explained, 194 by faith, and by works distinguished 208	
the Holy one, 94			
Alpha and Omega, .. 94			
Lord of all, 94			
Lord of hosts, 94			
searcheth the heart, .. 94			
quickeneth the dead, 95, 157			
the Lord of peace, .. 95			
is honoured as the Father, 95			
is worshipped, .. 95, 151			
the apostles bless in his name, 97			
is Jehovah, 97, 141, 147			
two-fold nature of, .. 99			
appearance of under the Old Testament, 137			
was known as <i>the Son</i> under the Old Tes. 137			
was proclaimed as the Son of God by John, 147			
the phrase, <i>the Son of God</i> , implied his divinity, 150			
divinity of, demonstrated by his miracles, 150			
divinity of, implied by the Apostolic system of doctrine, 157			
<i>See Son of God, Messiah and Word of God.</i>			
<i>Ignatius</i> 164, 333			
<i>Immortality</i> —of the soul, not known from reason, 19			
<i>Inspiration of scripture</i> —importance of, 257			
nature of, 260			
as to language, 269			
proved, 270			
of the Old Testament, 270			
of the New, 272			
objections to answered 276			
not always by suggestion 280, 284			
		<i>MAN</i> — <i>See Adam.</i>	
		<i>Matter, form and motion</i> —their analogy to the Trinity, 125	
		<i>Messiah</i> —opinion of the Jews concerning, 146	
		<i>See Jesus Christ.</i>	
		<i>Metaphor</i> —what, 123	
		<i>Mind, discourse, and wisdom or breath</i> —their analogy to the Trinity, 127	
		<i>Miracles</i> —demonstrated the divine perfections of the Son of God, and his union with the Father, 150, 159	
		<i>Miraculous conception</i> —asserted by Matthew and Luke, 331	
		confirmed by antiquity 332	
		by other parts of scripture, 334	
		connected with other scriptural doctrines, 336	
		evidence against, refuted 338	

	Page.		Page.
<i>Mysteries</i> —of the gospel,	39	<i>Power</i> —Holy Spirit not a mere,	105
not explained by the Socinians,	411	ascribed to the Holy Spirit,	105
created by Socinianism,	412	<i>Pre-existence</i> —of Jesus Christ,	68
<i>NATURE</i> —divine, ascribed to Christ,	76	<i>Priesthood</i> —of Christians,	189
<i>Nazarens</i>	338	of Christ,	189
<i>OLD TESTAMENT</i> —doctrine of the Trinity maintained by,	136	<i>Probation</i> —this the only time of	230
<i>PERFECTIONS</i> —divine, ascribed to Christ	73	<i>Propitiation</i> —the death of Christ a,	185
inseparable from divine nature,	75	<i>See atonement</i> .	
were manifested by the miracles of Jesus Christ, and proved his divinity,	151	<i>Punishment</i> —duration of future not ascertained from reason,	22
asccribed to the Holy Spirit,	119	distinguished from chastisement,	216
prove the dignity of the Holy Spirit,	121	eternal,	219
<i>Person</i> —the Holy Spirit a,	102	eternal accords with the general tenour of scripture,	229
<i>Personal</i> —affections, faculties, and offices ascribed to the Holy Spirit,	109	how described,	232
pronouns applied to the Holy Spirit,	110	does not imply annihilation,	234
distinction of the Trinity, in the Old Testament,	136	remediless,	235
<i>Personification</i> —of the Holy Spirit, not merely grammatical,	103	fire of unquenchable	236
figurative, what,	103	of Judas,	238
of the Holy Spirit, proper,	103	state of final,	239
<i>Persons</i> —the analogy of three, to the Trinity,	127	not to purify,	240
<i>Philosophy</i> — consequences of blending it with the doctrines of revelation.	32	<i>RANSOM</i>	192
<i>Phraseology</i> —of the schools, of no importance to the support of divine truth,	133, 161, 198	<i>Reason</i> —not the source of divine knowledge,	9
<i>Plea</i> —of Jesus Christ in behalf of men,	196	the judge, but not the rule, of divine truth,	25
<i>Polycarp</i>	165	<i>Reconciliation</i> —Socinian explanation of refuted,	178
		by the death of Christ	186
		<i>Redemption</i> —by price,	192
		<i>Repentance</i> —insufficiency of,	17
		consistent with atonement,	206
		<i>Restoration</i> —universal, considered,	245
		<i>Resurrection</i> —of the body, not ascertained from reason,	21
		second, explained,	240
		first and second,	241
		<i>Revelation</i> —the only source of divine knowledge,	9
		not to be subjected to the test of reason,	25
		<i>SACRIFICES</i> —eucharistical,	175

	Page.	Page
<i>Sacrifices</i> —piacular, - - - 175 for sin, - - - 175 levitical, - - - 176 of Christ, - - - 184 superiority of the, of Christ, - - - 188 of Christians, - - 188 origin of, - - - 190		
<i>Satan</i> —the chief of demons, Beelzebub, the devil, 45 a spiritual adversary, - 58		
<i>Satisfaction</i> —of Christ, 198, 202		
<i>Sin-offerings</i> —the nature of leviti- tical, - - - 175 the death of Christ a, 182		
<i>Socinianism</i> —the rise and pro- gress of in the mind 409 does not explain the mysteries which it must acknowledge, 411 mysteries created by, 412 undermines the credit of revelation, - - 414 destroys the leading doctrines of the gos- pel, - - - 416		
<i>Son of God</i> —his union with the Father - - 78 known as such under the Old Testament, 140 peculiarity of the phrase, - - - 148 implies the union of Jesus Christ with the godhead, - 150 worshipped, - 96, 151 meaning of the phrase among the Jews, 152		
<i>See Jesus Christ.</i>		
<i>Spirit of God</i> —not the mere ab- stract power of God 102 a person, - - - 102 not a figurative person 103 not a mere breath, 104 denial of personality of leads to atheism, 104 attributes of Spirit as- cribed to, . - - 105 intelligence of the, 106 volition of the, - - 107 personal affections, fa- culties, and offices, ascribed to the, 109 personal pronouns ap- plied to the, - - 111		
		<i>Spirit of God</i> —not having an ani- mated body, no ob- jection to the per- sonality of the, 112 benediction in the name of the, - - 112 fellowship of the, no objection to the per- sonality of the, - 112 certain expressions ap- plied to the, - - 115 supposed ignorance of the, - - - - 116 given and sent, - 116 not a creature, - - 117 is God, - - - - 117 not a being distinct from God, - - 117 called God, - - - 118 divine perfections as- cribed to the, - - 119 word of God ascribed to the - - - - 120 works of God ascribed to the, - - - - 121 divine perfections prove the divinity of the, - - - - 122 worship due to the, 122 the phrase implies his divinity, - - - - 160 influence of universal, 368 extraordinary influ- ence of the, - - - 370 Socinian doctrine of the influence of, 370 influence of the, the privilege of all, 372 illumination by the, 379 holiness by the, - - 386 repentance by the, 387 a sinner comes to Christ by the, - - - - 387 to the Father by the, 388 regeneration by the, 389 man inhabited by the, 392 sanctification by the, 393 obedience produced by the, - - - - 394 the fruit of the, - - 396 the consolations of the, - - - - 398 peace, - - - - 398 joy, - - - - 399 402 hope, - - - - 400

Page.	Page.
<i>Spirit of God</i> —objections to the ordinary influence of the answered, 404	<i>Unitarian</i> —Societies, constitution of, - - - - 34 disagreements of, - - 35
<i>Sun, its light and vital influence</i> —their analogy to the Trinity, - - - 125	<i>Unity</i> —divine, - - - - 64
<i>TEMPTATION</i> —of Eve, of Job, of Jesus, of mankind, from the Devil, 46, 50, 53, 58	<i>Use</i> —of the doctrine of the Trinity, - - - - 168
<i>Terms</i> —the use of different, relative to the death of Christ, - - - - 210	<i>VOLITION</i> —ascribed to the Holy Spirit, - - - 107
<i>Tertullian</i> - - - - 166, 333	<i>WICKEDNESS</i> —of mankind universal, - - - 285 of the Jews, - - - 287 of the Gentiles, - - 288 how accounted for, 289 scriptural method of accounting for the, 293
<i>Theophilus</i> - - - - 166	<i>Wisdom</i> —the folly of human, in things divine, - - - 28
<i>Trinity</i> —the doctrine of, - - 125 the unity of, - - - 129 distinction of, essential, necessary, and eternal, 129 necessity for a personal distinction of, - - 130 why a mystery, - - - 131 doctrine of the, maintained in the Old Testament, - - - 136 jews held the doctrine of the, - - - - 145 use of the doctrine of the 168	<i>Word</i> —of God, world created by, - - - - - 71 divinity of the, - - 82, 158 how distinguished from the Father, - - - - - 126 manifestations of the, under the Old Testament, 137 Jews held the doctrine of the, - - - - - 146 <i>See Jesus Christ.</i>
<i>UNION</i> —of the Father with the Son, - - - - 79	<i>Worship</i> —divine, paid to Jesus Christ, - - - 95, 151 due to the Holy Spirit, 122

INDEX TO THE TEXTS OF SCRIPTURE,

MORE OR LESS ILLUSTRATED.

	Page.		Page.
Gen. i. 1. -	136, 145	xxxiv. 16. -	144
2. -	125, 144	xl. 3, 5. -	97, 142
26. -	136, 318	9, 11. -	142
27. -	136, 296	13, 14. -	140
31. -	319	xliv. 24, -	124
iii. 6. -	307	xlv. 12. -	145
8. -	145	18, 21—25. -	99
14, 15. -	303	xlviii. 12—16. -	144
17, 19. -	308	liv. 6. -	99
22. -	136	Jer. i. 5. -	315
23, 24. -	311	xxiii. 5, 6, -	98, 143, 147
v. 3. -	295	xxxiii. 15, 16. -	98
xv. 1, 2. -	137	Ezek. viii. 13. -	143
xviii. 17. -	137	Dan. ix. 24. -	185
xxii. 1, 2, 12, 15—18. -	138	Joel ii. 28, 29. -	372
xxviii. 13, 20, 22. -	138	Mic. v. 2. -	129
xxxii. 24—30 -	139	Zec. xiii. 1, 10. -	98
Exod. iii. -	139	xiii. 7. -	143
vii. 1. -	86	Mal. iii. 4. -	97
xx. 5. -	145	iv. 2. -	125
xxiii. 21. -	139	Matt. i. ii. -	331
Lev. i. 3. -	180	i. 1—17. -	345
iv. 13—21. -	177	19. -	346
Num. xix. 1, 3, 4, 9. -	209	21—25. -	348
Jos. v. 13—16. -	140	23. -	336
Judg. vi. 12. -	140	ii. -	349
xv. 14. -	143	iii. 12. -	232, 236
Job i. -	50	iv. 3. -	158
xi. 12. -	291	5—11. -	45, 53
xix. 26. -	140	Matt. v. 26. -	243
xlii. 1. -	-	vi. 13. -	62
Psalm ii. 7, 12. -	140	ix. 18. -	281
xxxvi. 9. -	126	xii. 26. -	46
xlv. -	140	28. -	160
lxxx. 1. -	86	xiii. 30. -	232
xevii. 7. -	86	xiv. 32, 33. -	151
Prov. xxx. 4. -	141	xvii. 5. -	130
Eccles. vii. 29. -	319	xix. 17. -	87
Isaiah vii. 14. -	335	xx. 23. -	82
viii. 13, 14. -	99	xxv. 41. -	58
ix. 6. -	88, 145	46. -	216
xi. 1, 2, 10. -	142	xxvi. 24. -	238
xlii. 2. -	142	63—66. -	153

	Page.		Page.		
Mat. xxvii. 40.	- - -	- 133	Acts xi. 18	- - -	- 387
xxviii. 19.	- - -	- 65, 159	xv. 28.	- - -	- 107
Mark ii. 7.	- - -	- 93	xix. 3.	- - -	- 66
ix. 43.	- - -	- 236	Rom. i. 19—23.	- - -	- 23
x. 15.	- - -	- 317	iii. 19—31.	- - -	- 208
Luke i. ii.	- - -	- 331	23—26.	- - -	- 211
i. 3.	- - -	- 280	25.	- - -	- 190
15.	- - -	- 315	v. 10.	- - -	- 187
35.	- - -	- 120, 150	12—21.	- - -	- 305
ii. 1—5.	- - -	- 355	viii. 3.	- - -	- 196
41, 42.	- - -	- 357	12—23.	- - -	- 245
iii. 1.	- - -	- 361	27.	- - -	- 107
23.	- - -	- 345, 366	32.	- - -	- 149
iv. 41.	- - -	- 152	ix. 5.	- - -	- 90
x. 17, 18, 20.	- - -	- 57	x. 13.	- - -	- 157
xvi. 24.	- - -	- 243	xii. 1.	- - -	- 188
John i. 1.	- - -	- 82, 127	xiv. 4—6.	- - -	- 28
1, 2, 9, 14, 15, 30.	- - -	- 70	1 Cor. i. 2.	- - -	- 157
3, 10, 14.	- - -	- 71	ii. 9—11.	- - -	- 106
14.	- - -	- 158	vi. 3.	- - -	- 57
16.	- - -	- 77	19.	- - -	- 118
ii. 11.	- - -	- 151	vii. 25—40.	- - -	- 267, 268
iii. 3—6.	- - -	- 390	x. 14—16.	- - -	- 27
6.	- - -	- 294	xi. 3.	- - -	- 78
3, 31.	- - -	- 68	11.	- - -	- 120
16.	- - -	- 130, 148	xii. 6—11.	- - -	- 126
35.	- - -	- 131	8—11.	- - -	- 120
v. 17, 18.	- - -	- 152	11.	- - -	- 109
18, 19, 31, 33, 36, 37.	- - -	- 154	xiii. 12.	- - -	- 124
23.	- - -	- 95	xv. 47.	- - -	- 68
39.	- - -	- 26	2 Cor. i. 24.	- - -	- 278
John viii. 58.	- - -	- 70	iii. 12, 13.	- - -	- 38
ix. 38.	- - -	- 151	17.	- - -	- 382
x. 30.	- - -	- 78	iv. 2—4.	- - -	- 38
30—38.	- - -	- 86	6.	- - -	- 157
33—36.	- - -	- 153	v. 21.	- - -	- 183
36—38.	- - -	- 154	vii. 1.	- - -	- 394
37, 38.	- - -	- 79	Eph. i. 10.	- - -	- 245
xi. 25, 27.	- - -	- 151	ii. 3.	- - -	- 302
xii. 41.	- - -	- 94	18—22.	- - -	- 303
xiii. 3.	- - -	- 68	iii. 9.	- - -	- 247
xiv. 5—10.	- - -	- 79	17—19.	- - -	- 77
xv. 13, 14.	- - -	- 264	20.	- - -	- 379
xvi. 15.	- - -	- 130	iv. 7.	- - -	- 78
28.	- - -	- 68	22—24.	- - -	- 318
30—32.	- - -	- 154	24.	- - -	- 157
xvii. 5.	- - -	- 68	v. 5.	- - -	- 86
xx. 28.	- - -	- 82	23.	- - -	- 78
30, 31.	- - -	- 152	Phil. ii. 6.	- - -	- 80, 125
Acts i. 2.	- - -	- 127	iii. 21.	- - -	- 155, 247
ii. 38.	- - -	- 109	Col. i. 13—17.	- - -	- 72
iii. 3, 4.	- - -	- 118	15.	- - -	- 126
31.	- - -	- 387	16.	- - -	- 40
31.	- - -	- 157	19.	- - -	- 6, 130
x. 22.	- - -	- 95	20—23.	- - -	- 274

	Page.		Page.	
Col. ii. 9. -	76,	130	2 Pet. i. 1. -	85
iii. 9, 10. -	318		4. -	78
1 Thes. v. 19. -	376		ii. 1. -	92
1 Tim. ii. 4. -	246		4. -	42
iii. 16. -	84		1 John ii. 1. -	194
vi. 15. -	94		2. -	186
2 Tim. iii. 15, 16. -	271		18—22. -	159
iv. 1. -	157		iv. 1, 3. -	26
Tit. ii. 2. -	247		3. -	159
10. -	85		8. -	317
ii. 13. -	87		10. -	186
iii. 4	85		v. 13. -	159
Heb. i. 2,6, 8—12.	71		19. -	62
3., 3-	126, 131		20. -	87, 159
8. -	34		Jude 4. -	92
ii. 17. -	186		6. -	41
vi. 4—8.	232		9. -	56
x. 5—7.	68		24, 25. -	88
10. -	69		Rev. i. 3, 4. -	164
13, 14. -	210		8. -	93
15. -	221		14. -	112
xiii. 11, 12. -	210		iv. 11. -	94
15. -	189		13. -	246
James v. 4. -	94		xiv. 9—11. -	220
1 Pet. i. 17—19. -	211		xix. 13. -	127
ii. 5. -	189		xx. 6—15. -	241



F I N I S .

Lately published, and may be had of all Booksellers,
In 1 vol. 8vo., with a Portrait of the Author, price Nine Shillings in Boards,

PULPIT REMAINS, being the substance of several SERMONS delivered by the late REV. EDWARD HARE, carefully published from his Manuscripts.—To which is prefixed, a MEMOIR of his Life, by the late REV. JOSEPH BENSON.

Princeton Theological Seminary Special Library



1 1012 01006 7066